

THE
REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

NO. 1.—JANUARY 1890.

I.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF ETHICS.
HUMANITY, AS GENERAL AND INDIVIDUAL.

BY PROF. THOS. G. APPLE, D.D., LL.D.

IN entering upon the science of Ethics, which we may define in most general terms the science of the Good, we propose as an Introduction a consideration of humanity, viewed as general and individual. As man is the subject concerned in this science, particularly in reference to his ethical nature, it is highly important, as throwing light upon the whole theme, to have a right conception of what he is in his relation both to the world of nature below him and to the spiritual world above him, to both which he is organically joined, both in his generic and individual life.

Viewing him in his generic character as man, the *genus homo*, he stands at the head of the natural creation. In order to understand clearly what this headship comprehends, it is necessary, first of all, to have a proper conception of the organic character of the natural world below man. The natural world, taken as a whole, is an organism. In all its parts and processes

it is animated by one common principle, and from its lowest to its highest forms looks to a particular end. The parts are not brought together in an outward, mechanical way, but as the result of inward laws which bind them into an organic whole. This may be seen in the law, or method, of organization according to which the form and contents are related from the lowest to the highest forms of material existence. This relation is such that the degree in which the natural creation rises or advances the form gradually gains the mastery over the contents. In the inorganic kingdom we see matter in an almost formless state. Air, earth, water have indeed form, for they occupy dimensions in space, but their form is scarcely defined. In the crystal we see a definite mathematical outline, and here already there is a prophecy of the vegetable kingdom. In the vegetable kingdom inorganic substance is taken up by the principle of life and transformed into a new substance, as woody fibre, and the plant, in a more free way than in the case of the crystal, assumes still more definite forms. There is here apparent the principle of individuation, towards which nature seems to struggle from the beginning of its processes. In the animal kingdom this process of transformation goes forward through the plastic power of animal soul; inorganic substance and vegetable substance are transformed into animal flesh; the individuality of the animal is more marked than in the vegetable, and thus the form obtains a more complete mastery over the contents.

But creation does not stop here. Throughout all its orders it is governed by a primordial archetype, and that archetype is man. He is the end toward which the whole process tends, and according to the nature of all organisms he existed as the ideal in the beginning. In all existence whose creation involves a process of development, there is a profound sense according to which the end is in the beginning. Throughout all nature there are types and prophecies of man, growing clearer as it approaches its culmination. The relation between man and nature below him is inward and intimate. He is the

epitome of the world, its crowning summit. He is the interpreter of nature and its full meaning can be found only in him. The analogy has been expressed by regarding the human body as repeating in itself, yet in a higher form, all the processes and functions and operations of the natural world. Its skeleton represents the outward form of the earth in its mountain ranges, the respiratory apparatus, the action of the winds, the circulation of the blood, the water-courses above and beneath the surface of the earth, the nervous system, the action of electrical currents. This is not mere imagination or fancied resemblance. The earth is the womb of man's natural existence. His body was formed out of the dust of the earth, whether by an immediate transition, or, as many understand the account in Genesis, by just going through all the intermediate processes, *i. e.*, by being formed from the animal world. The deep sympathetic relation of man to nature has been felt and expressed by the poets of mankind. Science is more and more discovering the inner meaning of this relationship. It lies at the foundation of the capacity for caricature in representing types of men by certain animals. In the animal world are scattered fragments of humanity, so that man may study himself in that kingdom, as in the study of comparative anatomy. Man is related to the world of nature not as the actor to the stage, nor even as the householder to the house in which he dwells, but in a way far more internal and intimate than any of these, and similar comparisons, indicate. Man requires nature for his environment, and nature requires man as well, for without him it would be an abortion. As the harp is silent without the harpist, so nature would be dumb without man. Without the ear, there would be no sound, without the eye, no beauty of sunlight and color. All this accords with man's lordship over nature as taught in Genesis, and in other portions of Scripture, as in the viiith Psalm, and in the Messianic interpretation as given in Hebrews, and it is confirmed by all the investigations of science.

But man is not only the culmination of nature. He is also

related to a higher world. Humanity, as it came forth from the hand of the Creator, is a spiritual unity, including in itself all the various forms of life that have appeared in the unfolding of the race. It is not an abstraction, nor is it an abstract unit, but it is a living unity, in which all the parts are bound together by a common life. It is a spiritual unity, because although it takes outward form from nature, and therefore has a material side of its existence, yet its substance is a form of life from God. It is concrete because it becomes actual in the existence of the individuals who compose the human family. The union of the ideal and the actual gives us the real. In humanity from the beginning are included all the types that have appeared, as exhibited in the family, the nation, the different races, etc., as an original potentiality.

Humanity in this view is an objective entity, and not a mere abstract generalization of the mind. But it has no real existence apart from the existence of the individual. There is no such existence as the *genus homo*, before and apart from the individual *vir*, but the general holds its existence only in and through the individual, whilst yet they are not identical, just as in nature the species is a reality as it appears in the individual of the species.

These two, the general and the individual act, the one upon the other, as the leaves of a tree receive the life of the tree and then act reciprocally in producing the growth of the tree. The individual takes up into himself the race life in the bosom of which he stands, by intercommunion with his fellow-men. Such intercommunion is absolutely necessary for the development both of his mental and moral culture. It is by mind coming in contact with mind that his intellect is developed, and it is by mutual reciprocal life-intercourse that he integrates his moral nature. It is through mutual giving and receiving that his moral nature grows. Imparting to others the debt of love strengthens love, and returning gratitude increases the feeling of gratitude. Without such moral reciprocity the moral nature would remain undeveloped. This growth marks the degree in

which the individual takes up into himself the generic, or race, life. Men who receive into themselves this general life in the highest degree are the geniuses of mankind, from *genus*, race, or kind. True, the genius reciprocates, or imparts, according to his higher individual endowment, but this natural endowment consists already just in this, that the generic life, the race-life, is in him in a large degree.

The genius is a universal man more than others. We may illustrate this by the generality called nationality. Nationality is not an abstraction of the mind formed by generalizing the qualities common to a certain class of people living in a certain country. A nation is something more than a mere outward union of such a class of persons; but, as testified by the word, which comes from the Latin *nascor, natus*, it signifies a birth. There is a general life which works reciprocally upon the citizens, so that while the citizens form the nation, it is equally true that the nation forms the citizens. This national life is imbibed from early childhood,—nay, it forms a given type of citizens from birth, endowing them, so to speak, by birth with certain marked characteristics. Culture depends on this humanizing influence; a cultured man is a humane man. We speak of a study of the humanities, which means the taking in on the part of the individual, as for instance through the study of classic languages and literatures, those qualities and properties that pertain to cultured forms of life. To humanize is much the same as to render moral, because the moral nature is developed by this reciprocal action and inter-action in communion with our fellow-men. From all which it must appear how much the general or race life has to do with the development of morality; how much nature has to do with the determinations of personality. It is true that morality is attained through personality, through the determination of free will; but back of will is the human nature we inherit, and this universal human nature has its subordinate types in family and national life.

To complete our consideration of humanity we turn now, in

the next place, to man as individual and his relation in this character to nature and spirit.

Man as an individual is possessed of a psychic life, which unites him on the one side, through his body, with nature. This includes not only the body as a mere physical existence, but what we may designate the natural life—that life which exists only in union with the body, and which comes to him as a natural inheritance, or heredity, including the different temperaments, sex, race, etc. There is here a certain pre-existence for every individual, not indeed as held by Plato, Origen and others; not a complete pre-existence of souls, but rather a hereditary soul-life in union with the body, and through this with nature. The generic race-life here finds its individuation on the nature side of man so prolific in variety that no two individuals of the human race are entirely alike in form. There are types in race, nationality, etc., in which there are marked resemblances, but no complete sameness or identity. This peculiarity in each individual may be called his hereditary endowment, or capital, on the nature side, from which he is to build up his earthly existence, his natural manhood, so as to become an original being.

The resemblance reaches back not only to the parents, but through several generations—a resemblance that touches and affects, not only the physical nature, but also the intellectual, and even the moral nature, so that even good and bad qualities are thus transmitted. There is thus an aristocracy of blood, though this alone does not entirely determine the character in the line of descent, as we shall presently see. In the old palace of the Doge of Venice there were two doors of entrance for the people, still pointed out: the one for the blue blood, the other for the red blood, by which terms the aristocrats and the plebeians were distinguished. But while in this way certain advantages and disadvantages are perpetuated by natural descent, which would work out, it might seem, radical and perpetual distinctions which in the end would destroy entirely the proper unity of the race, there is another side in the individual

peculiarities which reveals a corrective for this and brings out a unity in men which lies deeper than such hereditary differences. This unity refers to the personality of each individual.

Every human being has a spiritual personality, by which he is more immediately related to God and a spiritual world. It has been said that every man is an original thought of God. His origin on this side of his existence is designated in Genesis, where it is said that God breathed into the body of man, which He had made, the breath of life, and man became a living soul. There is in every human being, therefore, a divine in-breathing, an inspiration from the Almighty. It is this which constitutes the peculiarity of personality in every man. And here again there are no two human beings exactly alike. Every one has his *proprium* in respect of personality.

This difference of personal endowment is such that from one line of descent may arise an individual who, by natural talent and its faithful cultivation combined, asserts his superiority over his family line, and becomes the head of a new line or family, and thus breaks in upon the law of transmission through hereditary descent. Thus it is that a certain equilibrium is maintained, and the equality and unity of the race are preserved.

We do not propose to consider here how these two sides of personal existence come together, so as to form a unity and not a dualism. They cannot have two absolutely different sources in their origin. The *Traducian* theory, which asserts that all which a man is and has, in body, soul, and spirit, are derived entirely from his parents, and Creationism, which maintains that only the physical side of existence comes from the parents, while the soul comes directly from God, must be in some way united. The theory of Creationism leads to a dualism in man's nature which is fatal to the theory, and Traducianism pure and simple fails to explain the peculiarities of personality that appear, and also that sense of direct relationship to God which dwells in the soul of every man. There is a double paternity of which all men are conscious. In addition

to the human fatherhood of man he has a fatherhood also in God, who is the framer of our bodies and the father of our spirits.

Perhaps we may say that whilst man derives his existence from and through his parents, both in body and in soul, yet in the natural birth of man there is a peculiar agency of God in a way that does not hold in the propagation of mere nature existences. But we do not attempt an explanation of this difficult problem; all that is meant to be asserted here is the general truth that whilst man comes from God as the ultimate and absolute source of his being, yet he is more immediately related to nature on the one side of his being than the other. This is generally recognized in the dichotomy of man's being as composed of body and soul, and of these the soul is conceded to be chief, because the soul can exist without the body, whereas the body without the soul is dead and ceases to exist as body.

Personality is the end of individuation in nature development; but it is something more than individuality, as we have this in nature below man. In nature the individual exists only for the species; self-propagation is the end of its existence. In man the person has an end in himself. The end of personality is *not* merely the propagation of the race; the individual exists not merely for the race; but the race exists as well for the individual, and personality has an eternal existence. The fault in ancient civilization consisted in exalting the general, the state, to the disregard of the rights of the individual; it was everything, he was nothing, comparatively speaking. In modern civilization the State is for the citizen, as well as the citizen is for the state, and the sacred rights of personality are recognized as well as the divine authority of the State. This independent importance of the individual grows out of the peculiar nature of personality. When this subject comes to be fully understood, it will, doubtless, be found that there is a deep truth in the theory of evolution as regards the origin of man, and that it can be complemented and held in such sense

as to be in accord with the teaching of Scripture on this subject. As inorganic matter is transformed and elevated into a higher state by the principle of life coming down into it (just the reverse here of what evolution teaches), and inorganic matter and vegetable substance are lifted into a higher existence by the entrance of animal soul, so we may conceive of the origin of man on the one side from nature, (and we see no reason why it may not be nature, dust, as this had already reached the animal state,) and on the other side in a more direct manner from God. Then, the problem of man's existence is for the spiritual in him to transform and elevate the natural, the bestial, so as to become prepared for a still higher elevation in the sphere of immortality. And for this end, as Christianity teaches, a new life-principle has come down into the heart of our common humanity in the revelation of God in the God-man, and His spiritual presence in man by His Spirit. We know this is not evolution pure and simple; it is, in one view, just the antipode, and denies just what evolution asserts as its chief principle, that in all the orders of creation the lower produces the higher. But in asserting this it is still conceded that in the lower there may be a latent power or potentiality which generates the higher. Whilst, therefore, there is an apparent contradiction, yet when properly understood there is at least much to encourage the belief that the evolution theory, at least all that is essential to it, may eventually be harmonized with the teaching of Scripture in regard to the origin of man. Science and revelation cannot disagree, because both are from one God; but the interpretations put upon them may not harmonize, because these may be very imperfect and faulty both on the side of scientists and theologians.

One more point we have to consider in this introduction, and that is, that in the development of his being man is confronted and met by certain primordial Ideas, viz., the True, the Beautiful and the Good.

Let us explain what is meant by this proposition. We have seen that man's existence on the natural side has a natural

environment. Upon this environment the unfolding and preservation of his life depend. He needs food to satisfy his hunger, water to quench his thirst; he must breathe in order to live; he must have light to see; there must be conditions to develop his hearing, yea, all his senses, and it is through the senses that all the powers of his being are awakened into exercise. Now, if man is a spiritual as well as a psychical being, it follows that his spiritual life, his personality, must have an environment upon which it depends for its development and maintenance. Assert man's spiritual nature, and you assert, at the same time, the existence of a spiritual world. What this spiritual world is in its substance, the in-itself, *das Insi:hself-sein*, of Kant, may be a mystery to us, just as the material world is. We know what the material world is as apprehended by us through the senses. So we know a spiritual world in our apprehension of it. As adapted to our spiritual powers, it takes a three-fold form, as the True, the Beautiful, the Good—a distinction that has long been made by psychologists and philosophers, and is made the basis of his metaphysical system by Cousin. The human soul on the spiritual side may be considered as unfolding in a three-fold division, or form, as the intellect, the phantasy, the will, though it starts in one common life-basis. The soul, in this view, is no more self-supporting than the physical life through the body. The intellect requires nourishment—an environment that conditions its development, yea, its very existence. Truth is the objective spiritual pabulum upon which it depends for nourishment. It apprehends the True through its thinking powers. Hence all intellectual education requires not only the exercise of the thinking or knowing faculties, but also the influx of spiritual substance in the form of truth. Without this, the mere exercise of the knowing faculties would be like physical exercise, gymnastics, without receiving food, diatetics. Nay, there can be no normal intellectual exercise without the apprehension of objective truth; the mind cannot remember without something to remember, nor think without the substance of thought. No

one can, therefore, consistently deny the objectivity of truth. We call this objectivity the Idea of the True.

But the phantasy, or form-giving faculties, included in conception, fancy and imagination, requires also objective conditions for its development, and these are comprehended in the Idea of the Beautiful,—beauty as an objective spiritual entity, manifesting itself through the myriad forms of beauty in the two realms of nature and art.

And then, in the third place, the moral nature of man, through its chief organ, the will, requires the objective sphere of the Good, for its development. The objective good becomes man's subjectively through the self-determination of the will. Hence the saying of the philosopher Kant, the only good thing in the universe is a good will, by which, however, we must not fall into Kant's false subjectivism and understand that the Good is only subjective and not also objective. Even Kant was forced to posit an objective good in the existence of God, the lawgiver, as necessitated by the categorical imperative in the reverence of moral law in the will, man's practical reason.

Of these three ideas, the True, the Beautiful, the Good, we may say that the last is the most central, the deepest, just as we may predicate this pre-eminence of the will in comparison with the phantasy and the intellect. Thomas Aquinas, indeed, gave this position to the reason, and accordingly made wisdom, the virtue of the reason, the highest of the cardinal virtues, but we prefer the position of Scotus here, and regard the will as the greatest, and love, the inspiration of the will, as the highest among the virtues, as St. Paul places it as chief among Christian graces.

Having to do chiefly with will as the faculty that apprehends the Good, Ethics stands closely related to a circle of kindred sciences. It is closely related to Psychology, one section of which treats of the will. It is also closely related to Theology, which treats in one of its departments of theological ethics. Then, also, it occupies common ground with the science of Jurisprudence, which treats of law. We may have what may

be called the ethics of Jurisprudence, that is, the ethical principles that underlie this interesting science. As we treat Ethics in its social aspect as well as related to the individual, it underlies all departments of Social Science, the ethical constitution of the Social Economy, in the family, the state and society generally. It will thus appear that ethics reaches out into a widened sphere, and supplies us with principles that enter into a broad circle of sciences. Especially does its importance appear in the general subject of *Sociology*, which is coming to be studied in a scientific form more than formerly.

A word may be added here on the relation of Ethics as we treat it to Christianity, as we consider it from the standpoint of reason, and therefore may designate it as philosophical ethics, in distinction from theological ethics. We might call it Christian Ethics, if by that title should be meant that it harmonizes with Christianity and is pervaded by the Christian spirit. But it might then be confounded with Theological Ethics, a study pertaining more directly to the Theological Seminary. In theological Ethics, the Scripture, or Revelation, furnishes the basis, as it is also the accepted authority. But Ethics, as an independent science, may also be treated from the standpoint of reason. Leaving the treatment of man's more direct relation to God to theology, Ethics concerns itself with the treatment of man's relation to his fellow-men under the requirements of the moral law. This restricts somewhat its area, but this is no objection, provided the relation between religion and morality then is properly explained. This, however, must be reserved until we have reached the conclusion of our sciences. We only state here, that in claiming a relatively independent sphere for Ethics as related to theology, for morality as related to religion, we do not claim entire independence, nor equality. Indeed, as will hereafter appear, we regard religion in man as the deepest element in his life, and all-pervasive in its moulding influence, but just for this reason do not treat the two as co-ordinate. We take our *data* from reason, as all philosophy must, but we recognize the light

that comes from revelation, yet this latter is accepted, not as in theology as an outward binding authority, but rather as it authenticates itself to and through reason.

The science of Jurisprudence, or of Political Economy, may be Christian, in that it is pervaded by the light and influence of Christian principles, yet in the case of either it builds upon the basis of reason, and not directly of revelation. So Ethics, as treating of the moral relation of man with his fellow-man, and of his own moral constitution and its development, has a field of its own. Its independent treatment prepares us all the better to understand its free relation to revelation and religion. The burden resting especially upon this age is to harmonize science and revelation, and in order to do this it is necessary, not to subordinate the one to the other, no matter which then asserts supremacy, but to give each its own independent prerogative. In the Middle Ages theology claimed this external relation to science, and the result was the suppression of all independent research in the sphere of science. Equally fatal would it be to exalt reason above revelation, as is done by modern rationalism.

Before our treatment of the science of Ethics is finally closed it will be made plain, we trust, that we do not fail to apprehend its close inward relation to the Christian religion.

II.

I BELIEVE IN GOD THE FATHER ALMIGHTY.

BY THE LATE REV. S. H. GIESY, D.D.

THIS *I believe*, standing at the head of the Creed, makes the grandest utterance which can come from mortal lips. It is altogether grander than *I think*, or *I reason*, or even *I know*, whatever their deep import and tremendous issues. It is, in a self-conscious breath, a being grandly endowed, owning his Divine Original and committing himself freely—his life and destiny—to that Infinite and Eternal One.

"I" is the exponent of personality, and separates man from all the world besides. It marks his essential distinction, and puts him in a class wholly by himself. It defines thus his own wonderful nature and his own wonderful place in the order of universal nature.

Besides, it marks each man's separate individuality before God. It is a man's own voice. No single person is lost in the great bulk of humanity, as a multitudinous and indistinguishable plural. And for such a being it is utterly impossible to roll off the conviction and sense of voluntary, conscious and, therefore, responsible action.

Even under a purely material aspect, nothing so majestic and grand as man. "I am fearfully and wonderfully made," said the Hebrew psalmist. In a merely anatomical view how perfectly wonderful the human body—its nice adjustment to specific purposes of bones and muscles and tendons and nerves, its curious apparatus of the senses, its organs of action and motion, its upright posture, with intelligent eye lifted aloft and noble brow kissing the sky—type at once of superior origin

and higher destiny—the master and king God made him of all beside (Psalm 8: 6–8)! Even Ovid noted this marvellous distinction and gave the thought this happy turn, that we alone of all creatures were made to look towards heaven, to teach us the design of our being and our true glory. The Greeks, too, have beautifully preserved the inherent sense of the same thing in a name singularly befitting,—ὁ ἄνθρωπος; according to Delitzsch, from ὁ ἄνω ἄθρων,* the up-looking one, eye and soul turned skyward, and through all his strangely chequered history struggling with the thought of God and the vast problem wrapped up in his own mysterious being. Whatever, in a purely physical respect, he chances to have in common with lower creatures, is in him made to take on absolute perfection of parts and the most admirable fitness for intended uses. No marvel, then, that royal psalmist breaks out in the sublime, impassioned utterance just cited.

Wonderful in structure, attitude and gait as the human body is, it is but the shrine of that which is more wonderful still. With all its erect and dignified aspect, the body is the smallest part of man. Its highest worth is that it forms the habitation and home of mental, and moral, and spiritual aptitudes immeasurably more transcendent and grand. What powers of thought, and reason, and memory, and conscience, and judgment, and will, and deep penetration, and vast knowledge, and astounding wisdom, and stupendous invention are here enshrined! It is a wonderfully thoughtful and intelligent soul that looks out of these little eyes of ours. The eagle, from his highest eyrie, will gaze with undimmed vision upon the sun in meridian splendor; but the eye of man has swept immeasurably further, has noted the very structure of the sun, calculated its dimensions, brought near the most distant stars, laid them out in a chart before us, so that we know their rising and setting, and, for that matter, can weigh them, as a man would salt in the balance.

A marvellous illustration is just at hand. In nothing is the

* Should not this be also ἕπερο οὐρῶς?

age so conspicuous as in its inventive genius. And not the least wonderful by any means is the photographic art, brought now to such perfection, such instantaneous action, that clear impressions may be had of the lightning's flash, of the bird on the wing, of the horse on a full run, of the surging waves, of the foliage swayed by the breeze. Recently the art has been applied to photographing the star-lit heavens, and with astounding results,—the stars, though continuing their unbroken course, yet retaining a stationary position with reference to the photographic plate.

Two brothers, Paul and Prosper Henry, for years engaged in making exact charts of the heavens, came in due course of observation to that region traversed by the Milky Way. Here their undertaking seemed to have come to a hopeless end. An article in *Die Gartenlaube*, translated for the *Science Monthly*, gives a thoroughly interesting account of their resort to photography in their deep perplexity. It says: "As is well known, the mild, lambent light of the Milky Way is caused by a conglomeration of countless millions of stars, placed behind one another to endless depths. To reproduce these millions of stars on charts proved to be utterly impossible. The two observers then summoned the art of photography, recently so much improved, to their aid. Therein lies the highest triumph of the human mind, that it is able, in the true sense of the word, to *force* Nature to reveal her secrets; that a ray of light, called into being in the most remote depths of space, created at a time ere perhaps the foot of man had ever trodden the earth, should to-day itself trace on a plate the outline and the form of that orb from which it emanated myriads of years ago."

This would seem to be a grander achievement of mind than any previous subjection of the subtle forces of nature to the will of man. Binding together the most distant parts of the world in intelligent communication with the rapidity of the lightning's flash and by the aid of a simple wire stretching across continents and oceans—past wonder as it is—would

seem to be, as it is in fact, an absolutely simple affair in the comparison. It is in the presence of such wonderful inventions by which he holds to his intelligent purpose the hidden, the most subtle and potent forces of nature, that man, by his mind, is seen to be the lord and master of the whole material creation, its echo and voice, its *raison d'être*, the reason and meaning of its own being, the one for whom it all was, the microcosm within the vast macrocosm, whose presence alone redeems it all from the charge of omnipotent waste.

Is this wonderful? Doubtless. And yet there are greater studies than astronomy pursued even under such advantages, and greater intellects to master them. Said the philosopher Kant: "There are two things which I cannot sufficiently admire,—the starry world above me and the moral world within me." The moral world within me! The grandest study of mankind is man himself. What a theme this has been for the Platos and Aristotles of the pre-Christian times, and the Baccos, and Kants, and Hegels, and Hamiltons, of later days, to revel in! To know one's self is a grander thing than to know the stars.

Is thought, is self-knowledge a great thing? A grander thing is the power of self-action. Yon bright orbs which nightly look down upon us from their far-off place in the sky are moved by a power which plays upon them from the outside, and blindly through unnumbered ages have they obeyed, to their own safety and the harmony of the universe. Here is the operation of inexorable necessity. How gloriously otherwise with man! He has been endowed with a power which no planet above him can claim, no creature below him can boast,—entire movement from a centre within. His the tremendous power, with tremendous issues, of moral freedom—power to make or mar the noblest character, power over his own course in life, power over his own destiny, power to turn this way or that way, power to do right, power to do wrong, power to do good, power to do evil, power to make a saint of himself, power to make a devil of himself, power to write on manly brow the

cross and sign of heavenly citizenship or the indelible marks of the vilest and lowest servitude.

This is the greatest thing in all God's universe: for a man to be able to look in upon and know himself; to measure, to grasp the full sense and compass of his own self-hood; to know himself not only as distinct from, but in this above all other beings on the earth; in a word, the power to say *I*. Whether the utterance be divine or human, it is the exponent of separate, conscious personality. And it was, first of all, divine, before ever it could be human.

"Whose is this image and superscription?" was our Lord's own question, shown the common coin of the country. We bear on being' and brow our Father's image. In that august and mysterious consultation which followed the creation of the material and organic world, this oracular utterance is made: "Let us make man in our *image*, after our likeness." How solemn and sublime this creative pause! Of course physical likeness cannot be meant, nor even once thought of. In all the finer qualities of the soul, the child may bear a closer likeness to the parent than any merely outward resemblance. Luthardt says: "The highest thing that can be said of God is, that He is His own Master." In this man resembles God—master of himself by means of his will. Grand and magnificent, doubtless, the powers of our mind, yet transcendently more magnificent and grand, it must be said, is this power of self-direction, in which we are nearest allied to God Himself—"His offspring."

Nevertheless, the Divine image is a marred one; no longer answering "as face to face in water," to the original imprint. Wretched confusion and disharmony in the moral world have ensued from the perversion of the will by sin. This, from Pope's "Essay on Man," is worthy of being reproduced as indicating a nature which, while never so demoralized, still distinguishes him from all other creatures, and makes it absolutely clear that he must be put in a class wholly by himself:

“Chaos of thought and passion, all confused;
Still by himself abused or disabused;
Created half to rise and half to fall;
Great lord of all things, yet a prey to all;
Sole judge of truth, in endless errors hurled;
The glory, jest, and riddle of the world.”

A true, but not an altogether comfortable description of human nature. Shakespeare's immortal rhapsody gives the other and more agreeable side: “What a piece of work is man! how noble in reason! how infinite in faculties! in form and moving how express and admirable! in action how like an angel! in apprehension how like a god!”

Above reason and will is conscience. It stands among our powers as a pilot at the helm. For the vessel's safe conduct, sailing out of harbor with flags gaily flying, freighted with precious lives related to other souls on shore, full of affectionate solicitude, a wise and masterful hand must be at the wheel. Incompetency there, recklessness there, ignorance or stubborn self-will there, and the noble bark may be dashed to pieces on dangerous rocks, and all on board be swallowed up and lost in the wild waters. St. James gives us this graphic figure: “Behold also the ships, which though they be so great, and are driven of fierce winds, yet are they turned about with a very small helm, *whithersoever* the governor listeth.”

There is in our moral nature a faculty, property, internal sense, call it what one may, marvellously similar in action. Reason and will, darkened and confused by sin, are not in themselves a law. For their guidance and right exercise everywhere and in all things, there is a power above them. Conscience sits upon the loftiest throne of our being, and is ever passing its judgments upon the decisions of the will and the conclusions of reason. It has not always spoken in the same voice, and uttered the same dicta; sometimes it has been a Jacob's voice in an Esau's impersonation. But in ever-growing distinctness along the ages it has been in the human soul a witness to God, and truth and righteousness—a power making to duty in its profoundest sense and two-fold direction.

It is a very autocrat. It will not down. Its voice is magisterial. Hushed once, it speaks again and again; now in the soft whisper of disapproval, then in thunder-tones of condemnation, offering strong and earnest protests against weakness and wickedness: "a worm," says the Divine Master, "that dieth not." Men are under it, not over it. It is no respecter of persons, chastises kings no less than peasants; makes itself felt in palace and in prison. Whether its reproofs be heeded or not, it remains still a faithful monitor; and though its commands be despised, they may not be annihilated. Through wretched indifference, neglect, contempt, it holds its sovereign place in the human breast, urging to duty, warning of faults, pleading for the right, dissuading from the wrong, leading to God.

Whence this internal sense of right and wrong, so potent, so universal, so absolute? All sorts and conditions of men are one in it. With no palate, a man could not recognize in anything the quality of sweetness or bitterness; and just as little, without this spiritual palate, should he be able to discriminate between the moral quality of actions. Our palate, natural and spiritual, is born in us and with us, an inherent and inseparable part of our wonderful being, as originally it came from God Himself.

Even Seneca affirms its Divine origin: *Animus magnus et sacer inhæret origini nostræ*; and charges with utter folly the man who neglects it, "*O te miserum si contemnis hunc testem.*" And Cicero thus expresses with equal distinctness his belief in its innate nature: "*Ratio summa insita in natura quæ jubet ea quæ facienda sunt, prohibetque contraria.*" Horace places in its certain action the nobility and strength of man: "*Hic murus æneus esto, Nil conscire sibi nulla pallescere culpa.*" Be this thy brazen bulwark, to keep a clear conscience and never turn pale with guilt. Of all, St. Paul's testimony to its Divine origin and universal action is most direct, when, speaking of the heathen being without the law, he says, "They show the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing

witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another."

On the opening page of human history it meets us, a terrible power of discomfort, sounding deep down in the first murderer's soul the pursuing question, "What hast thou done?" Moved by compunction for a life of recklessness and sin, a man exclaimed on seeing a dog enter a room in which he sat, "Would that I were that animal!" That animal, he believed, was without the sense of right and wrong which then so distressed him, had no consciousness of responsibility, and therefore he quite envied its perfect freedom from moral disquietude and pain. Through all the changing vicissitudes of human life and condition, this experience is uniform and universal. Modern civilization, though so prodigious, has not put us beyond it.

It is not the mere creature and product of human culture. Tainted by human weakness, twisted by human prejudices, infected by human corruption, it needs itself to be corrected and cultivated, as, indeed, all our reasoning powers, ere it is fully competent to discharge its sacred office in the constitution and conduct of man. But does it follow that it is acquired, and not original? Its necessary principle and postulate is God. It has absolutely come to us from Him: the Breath of the great Spirit, the very impress on the human soul of the Divine image, and not, as some would have us believe, the mere efflorescence and flower of our nature, noblest child of noblest brain. Cicero came far nearer the truth when thus profoundly he wrote, "It was always the persuasion of all truly wise men, that moral law was not devised by men or introduced by nations, but an eternal law, according to which the whole world must be ruled." Its ultimate basis is God, who commands and forbids. And this law is as old as the mind of God Himself. Hence the law upon which all obligation is founded is truly and pre-eminently the mind of the Supreme Divinity.

The boy was nearer right than many would-be philosophers of our day, who, to a bystander chaffing him, that, because the growing twilight had shut his kite from view, it was gone,

made quick reply: "No, I feel it pull." "And from beyond our sight the invisible things of God have hold on us, and in our hearts we feel them pull." We are, then, as much constituted to look at the things "not seen and eternal" as we are at the things "seen and temporal." We belong to two hemispheres, and together they make up the full, round globe of our being. Our reason, and will, and conscience all alike demand God.

"Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting;
The soul that rises with us, our life's Star,
Hath had elsewhere its setting,
And cometh from afar:
Not in entire forgetfulness,
And not in utter nakedness,
But trailing clouds of glory do we come
From God, Who is our home:
Heaven lies about us in our infancy."

Now believing, to such a being, is as *perfectly natural* as breathing to a new-born babe. It is the atmosphere in which we live and move; belongs to the deepest instincts of our being. Unbelief is against our nature. By labored process men must argue and write themselves into it, so absolutely foreign is it to the mind. Thousands have done this—are doing it. "Doubt is learned; but belief comes by nature." We have not to reason ourselves into it, only out of it. It stands, one may say, intrenched amid the original fastnesses of our grand nature, and must be assailed and set upon by all manner of argument,—learning, and scholarship, and philosophy, and science doing their utmost, and that only with partial and problematic success, the secret thought, as the needle trembling to the pole, still maintaining its Godward polarity. It steadily abides, while changing systems of unbelief perish and pass out of the very memory of man.

Beside being perfectly natural, belief is a perfectly reasonable thing. While it presents many things "hard to understand," above reason it may well be, but not contrary to it—nothing absolutely silly, preposterous and absurd. Its first

postulate is the *personal* God, the author and upholder of all things, the Father of our immortal spirits. "I believe in God" not in that dim abstraction which some men call nature or the soul of the world; "in God," not in blind, insensate, brute force; not in laws with no thought, nor purpose, nor ruling design back of them; not in chance nor in destiny; not in a stream of tendencies dignified with this high-flown, but meaningless characteristic, "that makes for righteousness;" not in the subtle plasticity of protoplasm, whatever that may be, from which, by spontaneous generation, has come a whole universe of living things,—from the simplest, higher forms appearing until man's unfathered advent; but in the living God, in the personal God, in God infinite in power, wisdom and goodness—the Father of mankind, "who hath made us, and not we ourselves."

For a man to think profoundly of himself and of the great outlying world is, in every such thought, to connect both it and himself with God. That just here belief has stupendous difficulties, no one is unwilling to admit. He is only a poor thinker and teacher who makes light of them or attempts to laugh them down. But grave and serious as they may be, they are not so great as the difficulties—aye, the impossible and downright absurdities—which unbelief would put upon us. "I believe in God"—the one, intelligent, self-subsistent, living, personal God—is an easier and far more rational solvent of the universe and life than the convenient hypotheses proposed as substitutes. That man was cast up on the waves of time from the slime in which lizards and reptiles breed, the merest waif, with no adequate and honorable parentage, is something much harder to believe than in the creative presence and power of the wise and Almighty God. That such a being, intelligent, self-conscious, self-acting, moved by reason and will, full of irrepressible longings for the infinite, ever feeling after God that so be he may find Him, should have come by happy accident, or crawled up out of senseless mud—who can think it?

"*Omne vivum ex vivo*"—life only from antecedent life—is

reason's and common sense's necessary principle and postulate. In his Belfast Address, Professor Tyndall makes this full and frank avowal: "Did I not believe that an Intelligence is at the heart of things, my life on earth would be intolerable."

Back of the *Iliad* must there stand a Homer; back of the *Divina Comedia*, a Dante; back of *Hamlet*, a Shakespeare; back of the *Paradise Lost*, a Milton; and back of this immeasurable universe, and back of man, immeasurably greater and grander, no adequate Mind and Power?

Belief, it must follow, is the *foremost of duties*,—"our bounden duty," using the familiar phrase from the Communion Office—a duty to which we are shut up by everything around us, by everything in ourselves, by our supernatural origin and our everlasting destiny. It is not a course of action set so much in choice as obligation. *Noblesse oblige* holds here. Rank imposes obligation. Highest birth and station claim character and conduct in fullest keeping. Earth has no higher birth-right than just this: "The offspring of God."

Humbly to own it and live it is man's pre-eminent duty. It ranks every other. No interests of time and sense are to be allowed to bring evasion or diversion; no responsibilities of earth to stand in the way of the responsibilities of eternity; no claims of society, state or station to work indifference and neglect, postponement and delay; no height of place and power to infringe upon the homage and service due the Highest and the Holiest.

When a man says, *I believe*, and means it when he says it, the utterance takes on for him tremendous enthusiasm and power. It is the soul's new breath, transfigures human life and character, moulds man after its own higher order. It makes the Godward movement of his entire being,—a swinging off from self as a centre of confidence and trust to find in God alone his true life, comfort and repose.

Men in myriads say it; many, with fatal glibness; others, with shameful levity; others, with parrot-like rote. But when men say it with all sincerity, they show it. Old things pass

away; the old life is abandoned. "Such faith is not dead or nugatory, but all-pervading, and not a secondary matter, but everything; and when perfectly sincere, it will bend the whole purpose of a man to love God's law, to do His will and to glorify His name."

The crown and proper conclusion of a being and life so noble is faith in God and the eternal verities, one by one detailed in the Creed. The manliest thing in all the world is for a man to step out from the crowd, and with firm voice and heart sincere, say, *I believe*. Honoring himself, he honors God most of all. Come, then, in all the majesty of thy manhood, in all the dignity and sublimity of thy nature, and standing before Him Who made and hath redeemed thee, say, with all a child's simplicity and sincerity: "*Lord, I believe; help Thou my unbelief!*"

"I will not leave you orphans,"—*Οὐκ ἀφήσω ὑμῶς ὀρφανούς*,—words, however, spoken in an hour of needed comfort, yet with broadcast scope and meaning. Man is no fatherless soul, a child without an adequate Parent and home in the wide universe. One is his Father and true home; and "Blessed are they which are home-sick, for they shall reach their home."

"I," as the exponent and utterance of conscious personality, necessarily indicates a source and origin superior to itself, not simply equal, and certainly not inferior. Ethics and physics are one in this: Water rises no higher than its spring-head. A being, in all his powers, attributes, aspirations, affections, so grand, so godlike as man, must rest, can rest only in a Being, and not any mere personification of dumb powers, but personal and moral, like himself, yet vastly greater than himself, greater than his mind can measure, infinite and independent,—**THE I AM THAT I AM** of the divine word. "Our limited consciousness," says an English writer, "implies the existence of a consciousness that is unlimited. The life of every finite personality bears undeniable testimony to the necessary existence of an infinite Personality. . . . We do not degrade the Almighty by saying that He thinks, and knows, and

wills. If the Power behind nature were destitute of these faculties, it would be infinitely inferior to the poorest type of man."

Everywhere we meet the same Godward aspirations; everywhere the same home-sickness. Man wants God; reaches after Him, *if haply he may find Him*. The idea of God is within us; belongs to us. Hence the desire after Him is universal: for so, with only the rarest exceptions, it would seem to be, which, like the comparative infrequency of blindness, proving the faculty of sight to be man's true and well-nigh uniform condition, serve really to establish this Godward feeling as being the soul's native and normal state.

As hunger implies food, and thirst water; so the presence in universal man of this deep moral intuition presupposes and postulates God. The capacity to know Him and apprehend Him could not be without its correlative—the Infinite and Eternal Reality. This makes the very ground and necessity of all natural religions. Hence, in representative persons standing widest apart in age, and culture, and conditions, social and national, the soul's irrepressible cry.

Says Job, sage of unknown birth and antiquity: "Oh, that I knew where I might find Him! That I might come even to His seat!" Says David, Israel's psalmist-king: "As the hart panteth after the water-brooks, so panteth my soul after Thee, O God. My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God." Says Homer: "As young birds open their mouths for food, so all men crave for the gods." Says an Indian philosopher—"a very different type of man from Homer": "As birds repair to a tree to dwell therein, so all the universe repairs to the Supreme Being." Says Epictetus, a heathen moralist of wonderful power and thought: "If I were a nightingale, I would, by singing, fulfill the vocation of a nightingale; if I were a swan, by singing, the vocation of a swan. But since I am a reasonable being, mine is to praise God. This is my calling. I will fulfill." Says Cicero, a foremost man of the classic period and people: "There is no people so wild and savage as not to have believed in a God, even if they have been unacquainted with

His nature." Says Plutarch, the contemporary of Tacitus: "You may see states without walls, without laws, without coins, without writings, but a people without a god, without prayer, without religious exercises and sacrifices, has no man seen." The force of this loses nothing from modern discoveries.

Thus, it seems, the consciousness of God is the inseparable component of self-consciousness: that man no sooner comes to think and know himself than he proceeds to grapple with the profoundest subject of thought and study: that because of the deepest ground of unity of mankind—offspring of a common Father—the Indian thinker, the Greek poet, and moralist, and historian, the Roman orator, the Hebrew psalmist, and the old patriarch, unlike as men well could be in character, circumstances and country, were yet marvelously alike in the irrepressible belief in God to which such various but unmistakable utterance is given. Between primitive and modern life lies a whole world of fresh ideas, but theism, pure and essential, remains unshaken—still holds its place firmly in the general mind despite the so-styled advanced thought of the times, scientific and philosophic.

In this respect, the new differs none whatever from the old world, save in the character of its sacred buildings, and the personal conception of God everywhere enshrined. In every city, town and hamlet stand edifices, some modest, others more pretentious and magnificent, adorned with painted walls and decorated windows, surmounted with lofty spire, lifting the eye skyward and designating at once the sacred use to which they are consecrated and held apart. There is no perceptible break or change in the worshipful character of the universal heart. Modern London and New York, with their populace of teeming millions, stand here precisely on the same plane with Athens and Jerusalem of old. Now, as then, perhaps more now even than then, these grand structures meeting the eye everywhere express the profoundest intuitions of our nature, "a yearning which no words can adequately utter, much less overstate"

Whether in the number or magnificence of these sacred sanc-

tuaries and shrines, the modern scarcely surpasses the ancient world. Not to ridicule, but hold up the religious sentiment to honor and respect, that in Athens we are told there were almost as many temples as houses and more gods than men to worship them. And though deeply moved when confronted by the sight of all this enthusiastic and expensive show of devotion, yet is the Christian apostle himself not slow to perceive and commend, notwithstanding ill-directed, the great "carefulness in religion," underlying it all. And, in any serious effort to come upon the secret explanation of all such strange and to us seemingly monstrous devotion, we do well to follow his lead, seeing in it the mighty craving of the human heart for God, and where, untaught of Heaven, framing and fashioning gods to meet their every emergency amid the grave uncertainties of life. Some see in it the result merely of the faith or the superstition in which people were bred; "not a witness to the existence of God, but to the fact that they were taught to believe, or to assume, that there is a God."

No conjecture could well be more superficial. The great apostle struck the key-note to the idolatries of the world, under manifold forms and through all ages, when, though all wrong in their directions, he taught us, in a singularly commendatory phrase, to regard them as the outcome of the primitive and inbred intuitions of universal man.

"From the beginning," well says another, "and in every land on which the sun looks down, as soon as men could read and interpret themselves with any intelligence, there has arisen the cry which we still hear as often as we pause and listen to the voice of our hearts; the cry for God—the cry for a God who not only once appeared unto men, but is always at work in the world, shaping all things to His mind; the cry, not for a dead creed, or for a probable account of what God is and what His policy may be, but for a living Person, for an active Ruler and Friend, who loves us and dwells with us, and is able to satisfy those deep, deep desires for wisdom, for goodness, for peace, we cannot satisfy of and for ourselves."

Under this absolutely personal form, the earliest and foremost representative was the old Hebrew people, making a wonderful people and a more wonderful literature. The whole history of thought gives us nothing comparable to it—inflexibly one in subject, and purpose, and informing spirit, yet so various in style and method and authorship. Biography, poetry, history, prophecy—now a lyric song, now a national psalm with the breath of a high and holy inspiration, now the long sweep of mighty events condensed into a single clause, now the high and lofty diction of the seer, gifted as few with foresight and fervor, now the collected wisdom of unknown and unnumbered sages, now a priestly prayer, and now a philosophic meditation—enter into its composition. Wonderful diversity, more wonderful unity! In one sense, a single book, in another sense, a whole library—a people's entire literature; and together making the Self-revelation of the One, Eternal God, as this is seen to have led the fortunes of that people, giving an inspiration and upward impulse observable among none other.

Diverse as these sacred writers were in position and native power peasants, and kings, and priests, and herdsmen, and warriors, and autocrats, and law-givers, one profound conviction is predominant and controlling: The Personal Being of God. Of them all, perhaps, none was so fully possessed by it, and gave it such clear, ringing utterance as the psalmist, seated on Israel's proud throne. His are clarion notes. Here is a soul intensely earnest and honest. Asking for reality, downright and majestic, it could not occupy itself with any confessed semblance and shadow. "My soul is athirst for God, yea, even for the living God," is his own deep profound utterance.

How significant! Life is everywhere; higher and lower forms of being. There must be an adequate cause, a life-giving starting point. "*Omne vivum ex vivo*"—life only proceeds from antecedent life. The Author of life must Himself live. This marks the wide distinction of the Hebrew conception of the true God from that of the outlying nations, "As for all the

gods of the heathen; they are but idols"—a dumb show of divinity; "graven by art and man's device;" human sculpture and carving; insensate stone and wood; destroyed by rude blow or perishing in the merciless flames; touched by human violence; with no existence in themselves and no power in word or deed—"but it is the Lord that made the heavens"—the living Root of all being, the Source and Support of all things. Nothing in all literature so irresistible and overwhelming in this respect as the old prophet's keen irony: "He heweth him down cedars . . . he taketh thereof, and warmeth himself; he kindleth it, and baketh bread; yea, he maketh a god, and worshipeth it; he prayeth unto it, and saith, Deliver me; for thou art my god" (Is. xliv. 9-17)—clearly seen to be mere things, having no independent existence, and no resistive force, the product and plaything of man, and so only a wretched fraud and cheat in the line of immortal aspirations and hopes, Godward instincts and feelings.

And as little better are the ideal substitutes which are now made to masquerade before the world for the true and eternal God. The speculative thought of the day offers this intense craving of the human heart nothing more satisfactory. How utterly impossible it is for an earnest and honest soul feeling after God, to put itself off with Strauss's sublimated notion of a "personified universe," or Comte's "personified humanity," "a Being," as he conjectures, "immense and eternal," or Arnold's "power making for righteousness," or Fiske's "dramatic tendency." Who could love, give his confidence to, rest in, throw his arms around the neck of such a phantom-god, the sheerest abstraction only, and say, even with half the satisfaction of the old beclouded idolatry, "Thou art my God." The monstrous caricatures in Isaiah's time merited his severe irony not any more than the vague, intangible, mythical notions of the speculative mind so sedulously laboring to rid itself of the thought of a personal God in whom our being stands, the fountal source of all things.

Once in my presence a little child threw his arms about his

mother's neck and with loving confidence whispered his earnest wish into her ear. No less man wants a loving ear into which to pour his soul's greater cry: a real Father's neck to throw his arms about—not a mere pervasive energy, a dreary unresponsive tendency. The child of man with eternal cravings wants the Father Almighty: a personal being, the Personal God.

“Subtle thoughts and speculations
Of past ages and our own
Cannot reach my expectations,
Which cry out for God alone.”

The ideal substitutes offered by modern adversaries of the truth in room of that everlasting Reality they would take away from us, can in no way reconcile us to the tremendous loss they would inflict. A bank of fog against the distant horizon only to an unpracticed eye seems the wished-for land, but deceives not an old voyager. As vain the philosophy which would persuade us that we have suffered no loss in taking an unreal vision for the unmovable, unwasting Rock (Psalm xviii. 2, 31), the heart's sole strength, refuge and rest. Were He gone, then, indeed,

“The pillared firmament were rottenness,
And earth's base built on stubble.”

Freely have candid unbelievers themselves expressed this abiding sense of loss in the surrender of the old faith. Under the assumed name of “Physicus,” an able writer makes this clean breast of it in his “Candid Examination of Theism”: “I am far from being able to agree with those who affirm that the twilight doctrine of the new faith is a desirable substitute for the waning splendor of the old. I am not ashamed to confess that with virtual denial of God, the universe has lost to me its soul of loveliness; and although from henceforth the precept ‘to work while it is day’ will doubtless gain an intensified force from the intensified meaning of the words ‘the night cometh when no man can work,’ yet, when at times I think, as think at times I must, of the appalling contrast between the

hallowed glory of that creed which once was mine, and the lonely mystery of existence as I now find it—at such times it will ever be impossible to avoid the sharpest pang of which my nature is susceptible. For, whether it be owing to my intelligence not being sufficiently advanced to meet the requirements of the age, or whether it is due to the memory of those sacred associations which, to me at least, were the sweetest life has given, I cannot but feel that for me, and for others who think as I do, the precept, ‘know thyself,’ has become transformed into the terrific oracle of Oedipus, ‘Mayest thou never know the truth of what thou art.’”

Quite as pathetic on one occasion was Professor Clifford’s betrayal of this sense of loss in the repudiation of the old belief: “We have seen the spring sunshine out of an empty heaven upon a soulless earth, and we have felt with *utter loneliness* that the Great Companion was dead.”

What conception of God, then, is alone adequate to satisfy this intense and almost universal desire is not far to seek. Certain it is not as a subtle, mysterious Force, or mere dumb power. Power draws to itself no heart with responsive sympathy and trust. It kindles admiration, inspires awe, but no devotion, no intense, persistent enthusiasm; touches no chord of feeling and affection in the human breast; stirs the soul with no thought, or purpose, or movement, either of confidence or homage. It terrifies, subdues, strikes one dumb; but lends no inspiration to a higher and holier course. In dread only, a man faces the fierce lightning, splintering the majestic oak from top to bottom, but he cannot love it; or, as it strikes down by his very side the wife he loves and lives for, he cannot say and will not, as he lifts up her lifeless form, “Thou art my Friend—my God.”

Thought, intelligence, emotion, feeling, affection, conscience, will—personal attributes, and every man’s property, in greater or less degree—postulate alike personal and moral attributes in God. In this essential and inmost constitution of our being, we cannot be other and higher than He; and we will not be con-

tent to read in any inferior sense than the one just now indicated the Biblical phrase: "the image and likeness of God." We are persons, in the highest scope and meaning; and therefore God, from whom we come, is Himself a Person. He must be such to take Him to our heart of hearts, to delight in Him, to put our whole trust and confidence in Him, to be drawn to Him, to pray to Him, to worship Him, and serve Him. Only because He is this, and we, too, are this, is it that our nature responds to His call, and our conscience re-echoes His commandments.

Thinking seriously of our mental, moral and spiritual nature, with an intellect capable of astounding achievements, creating a very world of delight, with an independent will, chiefest mystery of our being, capable of saying "I am I," turning from the right and doing the wrong, soaring to the very heavens, or sinking to the lowest hell, with a spirit, despite the limitations of earth and sense, full of hopes and aspirations, and hopes for the future, if we think of God at all, we must necessarily think of Him as One to whom we are like, possessing the same personal elements, only immeasurably transcending all human powers. What we are, as said in the outstart, compels me to believe in One not my inferior in any way, nor my equal simply, but infinitely my Superior, the original cause of all things, the fountal source of life.

In this line of thought the pious Psalmist of the ancient days leads the way: "He that planted the ear, shall he not hear? He that formed the eye, shall he not see?" If the organs of intelligent sight and sound, much more are the majestic powers of reason, conscience and will in us but themselves the shadow and reflection of all, and which find in God their deepest Personal reality and ground. Hence this first utterance of the Creed, firmly and consciously made:

I believe in God.

But the Creed goes, must go further. With the idea of God, it connects inseparably His essential character, fetching from the

dearest and tenderest relations of earth the one word best fitted to represent it: The Father. Power may be cruel, malevolent, remorseless; authority, autocratic, tyrannical; kingship, too often, despotic, imperious, arrogant. Fatherhood is commonly kind, considerate, tender, loving; sacrificing self for the good of the child for whom he lives.

As applied to God the name shadows forth the grandest reality and a marvelous Self-revelation. As in the smooth lake we read the brightness and glory of the sky bending over it, so in this sweet word of human childhood are portrayed the characteristics of God which bring Him nearest to us and us to Him. Let us prize this order beyond everything that we are taught to think of Him and call Him Father before the *Maker of heaven and earth*. That means power, creative force, before the manifestations of which I may stand dazed and awed; the other represents love, care, interest, a tender, self-sacrificing thought which deeply touches my soul and warms it up to filial affection and obedience. "God is love" makes it at once the profoundest and best definition of God.

In its deepest sense—the sense which attaches to it in the later Scriptures, and in the Creed—the Name stands for a gracious and spiritual, and no mere natural relation. True, to the Jews already, the Fatherhood of God was not unknown, for Isaiah says, "Thou, O Lord, art our Father, our Redeemer, Thy Name is from everlasting," and Malachi asks, "Have we not all one Father, hath not one God created us?" And even among Greeks and Romans there was a dim conception of a great All-Father, "the Father of gods and men," as St. Paul acknowledged when quoting to the Athenians these words of one of their own poets: "For we are the offspring of God;" indicating nothing more than the natural relation. Shining worlds and crawling worms, could they speak, might say as much.

It is only when we come to the manifestation of His love in the person of His incarnate Son that we meet this best name for God in its full and gracious sense. By that one stupendous

act of redemption, humanity has been lifted afresh into Divine sonship. How bold and broad St. Paul's words: "When the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." "Behold what manner of love the Father hath betowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God!" When once this embodied pity and compassion of God to our fallen race is fully apprehended, how intensified the sense and fact of the Divine Fatherhood! how natural and clear seem such truths as redemption, immortality and eternal life!

Happiest and best of thoughts! Despite our sin and guilt, in the face of Jesus Christ, God's essential Son, we may look up to the Eternal Throne and call Him who occupies it "Our Father." Boon and privilege alike to all men! Taking up the common nature of all men, of a Peter and a Pontius Pilate, of a Paul and a horrid Nero, it was in and by Christ that the world's wicked Neroes, and Herods, and Pontius Pilates, alike with its Johns, and Peters, and Pauls, come into the one family of God on earth, and in the highest heavens be with the children of the Highest.

Hence this remaining word of changeless purpose, unailing grace, Almighty. It stands in the Creed, not for absolute power, but a scheme of mercy, of perennial force and character; a gracious attitude on God's part, affected not by any change of attitude on man's part—what St. Paul characterizes as "the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which He purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord." Hence the comma where it is—after and not before "Almighty."

St. James put the Divine Fatherhood in this strong way: "The Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." Fitful and capricious is human fatherhood; bright as the sunshine one day, with the next a thundercloud passes over it. Everything has gone wrong through the day. Trusted men have shown themselves liars; losses have followed swift on the heels of miscalculation; richest argosies

have been swallowed up and lost at sea. And the father carries to his home the worries of business. It could hardly be avoided. The cloud on his brow depresses all the rest. Petulant words come to make a sorrowing heart. Besides, earthly fatherhood is limited in range and resources,—the heart far bigger than the purse, ability less than purpose, wanting in wisdom and foresight, blundering from sheer ignorance or blind partiality, and doing a manifest wrong when right was clearly intended.

“No shadow of turning.” Divine Fatherhood is widely different: “too wise to err, too good to be unkind;” making no mistakes; knowing and always doing the very best thing; seeing the end from the beginning; never moved by caprice; dependent on no contingencies, and general only in being special and minute, making count of the number of our hairs and noting the sparrow’s fall.

No sorrow can touch us but of His will and purpose; and no shadow fall across heart and hearth-stone but the loving Father sent it for the child’s eternal good. “We may rejoice then that the one Creed of our Baptism lifts up our thoughts to a higher level; that it extends the scene on which the issues of life are played out; that it places all that we see in connection with the eternal.” Among all the changes and chances of this mortal life, what immense confidence of a right issue it gives to say:

“I believe in God the Father Almighty.”

A like confidence comes in the wider range of historic life. He is the “Father Almighty.” The end is involved in the beginning. Here is far-reaching purpose. Nothing turns on mere capriciousness. No sign or trace in His governance of vacillation, or fickleness, or hesitation. “He is the same yesterday, to-day and forever.” No events lie at the mercy of fortuitous circumstances or adventurous crime. The very wrath of man is made to praise Him,—mad ambition, the policies of kings, the schemes of men, the armies of earth doing

unwittingly the will of heaven. "There went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus that all the world should be taxed. And all went to be taxed, every one to his own city. And Joseph also went up from Galilee, out of the city of Nazareth, into Judea, unto the city of David, which is called Bethlehem. . . . And so it was that, while they were there, the *days were accomplished.*"

Nothing is abandoned to chance. "God is in history," if men did but so read it, overruling this man's selfishness and that man's party ends for beneficent results which in no way entered into their calculation, thwarting the evil men intended and making it work out the good not intended, timing the march of mankind to the music of heaven. "As for you, ye thought evil against me; but God meant it unto good."

Faith disarms fear as one discerns the hand of a mystic Weaver fashioning the tangled threads of human devices and projects into the beautiful fabric of Divine action, undoing the knots of all petty spite, and making the very malice of hell roll in a scheme of grace involving the widest and best interests of humanity to the latest generation. The hand and plan of God run through it all. Some one has given the thought this poetic shape:

"See the Mystic Weaver sitting
High in heaven—His loom below:
Up and down the treadles go;
Takes for warp the world's long ages,
Takes for woof its kings and sages,
Takes the nobles and their pages,
Takes all stations and all stages.
In the present all is mystery;
In the past 'tis beauteous history."

III.

THNETOPSYCHITAE; OR, AGAINST THE SLEEP OF THE SOUL.

BY REV. J. B. RUST, A. M.

THIS discussion is not intended to combat the materialistic dictum that death ends all. The materialist holds a position entirely extra-biblical. That is to say he does not believe in the existence of God nor of a spiritual realm and hence repudiates the claim of the Scriptures that they contain the revelation of an Almighty Will as to the purpose and destiny of man. In his view the phenomena of mind are only a product of the universal and eternal forces inherent in matter. On the other hand the advocates of soul-sleeping neither deny the existence of God, His revelation in Christ, nor the higher destiny of the human family. What they do teach is that conscious existence on the part of man confines itself wholly to bodily life. They identify body and soul. Unlike the materialist they appeal to the Scriptures in support of their doctrine, claiming that the belief in the immortality of the soul as cherished by Christians generally is of heathen origin and has no foundation in the Bible. Therefore this argument will be based wholly upon the Scriptures with the purpose of discovering whether they teach, as we believe they do, that the existence of the soul is continuous after death, or whether they present any good grounds for holding that death is a subsidence into a state of unconsciousness.

The question before us is not whether man has a destiny beyond this lower life of his, but whether a long period of practical extinction follows the completed process of physical dissolution. Whatever references will be made in the course of

this argument to history and science, are to be regarded as side lights bearing incidentally upon the real question at issue. But we shall aim to use such references in an impartial, strictly logical and honest way.

The doctrine of the sleep of the soul is not a new one. To it as well as to so many notions and the practices that grow out of and accompany them, the old saying of Solomon may be applied: "There is no new thing under the sun."* Among the various religious sects which appeared shortly after the introduction of Christianity were the Thnetopsychitæ. Though sharing the fate of other organizations that like them separated from the parent stem of Christian doctrine and practice out of zeal for some quaint or curious notion and formed a family of their own only to be swept away or swallowed up again, the doctrine by which they were distinguished has been handed down to modern times. It is not at all improbable that their teaching concerning the condition of the soul after death was a modification of the Sadduceean denial of immortality. This modification consisted in the assertion that conscious existence absolutely ceases at death but will be restored at the time of the resurrection. The sect must have been rather influential if not strong numerically in the third century, otherwise its chief tenet would not have challenged the attention of the learned men of that day. A council in Arabia asked Origen for his opinion on the teaching and the great church-father pronounced it heretical. The sentiment of Christendom having been overwhelmingly opposed to the dogma silenced its disciples and for many centuries they ceased to press themselves upon the notice of orthodox believers. However, during the Middle Ages, that is to say in the thirteenth century, the teaching was again revived in Arabia and became so potent a factor in religious belief that it received the assent of Pope John XXII. And it continued to find advocates until the time of the Reformation when the Anabaptists incorporated it in their creed and Calvin attacked it in a treatise. Since then Reinhart and Delitzsch in

* Eccl. 1: 9.

Germany, Coward and the Irvingites in England and Roorda in Holland have advocated the same idea.*

Perhaps the most noteworthy exponent of the denial of natural and necessary immortality was William Coward (1656-1725), a physician educated at Hart Hall and Wadham College in Oxford. The philosophy of sensation which John Locke advanced in his celebrated work entitled: *The Human Understanding*, called forth many discussions among Materialists, Deists and Christians concerning the nature and destiny of the soul. "Some of the Deists insisted on Immortality as involved in the very essence of the soul and so self-evident as to be incapable of being confirmed by Revelation." Coward in a work which he wrote on the subject took the ground that "the notion of a human soul as believed to be a spiritual immortal substance united to a human body is a plain heathenish invention and not consonant to the principles of philosophy, reason and religion." He taught that every man dies as a beast but has the prerogative to be raised to life again. However, Coward's views proved to be so unpopular that the House of Commons in 1704 condemned two of his works, *Second Thoughts* and *The Grand Essay*, to be burned by the common hangman.†

Ever since the world began, at least from the time when first the problems of existence exercised the human mind, men have been divided in opinion, some ranging themselves on one side of a question, some on another. For many centuries the speculations of inquirers were confined to philosophy and religion because for some reason nothing else suggested itself as food for thought. When once the human mind became emboldened to assert greater freedom and threatened to deal with experimental facts independent of the traditions of faith and the commonly accepted ideas concerning the nature of the physical universe, the Church undertook to terrorize mankind into unity and thus to destroy a growing tendency to investigate the phenomena of the world by creating new articles of faith and

*Vide Van Oosterzee, *Dogmatics*, Vol. II, p. 780.

† Vide Ueberweg, *Hist. Phil.* Vol. II., p. 372.

declaring their acceptance as absolutely necessary to salvation. For a time the effort was successful. But whilst the strong arm of ecclesiastical power and prestige may be able temporarily to frighten the bold adventurer into silence, it cannot uproot a mental reservation, a desire to know, that carries with it the right of individual existence, especially if it wears the appearance of being in harmony with the Scriptures and does not inflict injury upon society. The opinions of men, if at variance with or in advance of the general thought of an age, though forced into the background for a time by the exercise of existing authority, will sooner or later assert themselves and gain the light of day. Men always have differed and they always will, especially on questions that lie beyond the grasp of reason, and the world is full of such problems. A child can ask more questions than a philosopher can answer. Hence we need not wonder that the inquiry into the nature and destiny of man assumed a phase that to many seems both unreasonable and evidently is unscriptural, namely the denial of the continued existence of the soul as a spiritual entity independent of the body.

The fact that the advocates of this dogma appeal to Scripture in support of it and declare it therefore to be a revealed truth, appears incongruous to those who have been taught differently, and has a tendency to shock a sensitive conscience schooled into other convictions. And yet it is not impossible to adduce passages from Scriptural sources which lend plausibility to the position and to cite forms of expression that give it a vague support. If these passages of Scripture stood alone or agreed throughout with what little light—enough for all practical purposes—the Bible grants us concerning the future and remained unaffected by a strict application of the hermeneutical rule that Scripture interprets Scripture, there would not be any room for controversy. But the Bible must be taken as a whole whose every part is organically united by the divine purpose of salvation from the power of sin and the punishment of human guilt. Ignoring this fact or refusing to grant it its full weight of testimony, believers in the sleep of the soul become boldly

dogmatic and pronounce the faith in immortality as commonly entertained by the Christian Church to be unwarranted and unscriptural.

Let us notice a few of the arguments that are presented by them in accordance with this spirit.

In the first place they call attention to the frequent mention of death as a sleep, especially in the Old Testament. In II Samuel, I and II Kings and II Chronicles the writers of those historical books use the expression: And he slept with his fathers, at least thirty-eight (38) times. Job says: "I have sinned; what shall I do unto thee, O thou preserver of men? Why hast thou set me as a mark against thee, so that I am a burden to myself? And why dost thou not pardon my transgression and take away my iniquity? For now shall I sleep in the dust and thou shalt seek me in the morning, but I shall not be." Job 7: 20,21.

Again the word destroy so often found in the Bible is used to interpret the meaning of the word death. "And whatsoever soul it be that doeth work in that same day, that same soul will I destroy from among his people." Lev. 22: 30.

"And the Lord said: I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth." Gen. 6: 7.

"And Abraham drew near and said: Wilt thou also destroy the righteous with the wicked?" Gen. 18: 23.

"Let them be ashamed and confounded together that seek after my soul to destroy it." Ps. 40: 14.

Passages like the following are appealed to to prove that the Scriptures teach death to be a state in which the mental faculties are entirely suspended.

"For in death there is no remembrance of thee; in the grave who shall give thee thanks!" Ps. 6: 5.

"Consider and hear me, O Lord my God; lighten mine eyes lest I sleep the sleep of death." Ps. 13: 3.

"Behold the eye of the Lord is upon them that fear him, upon them that hope in his mercy, to deliver their soul from death." Ps. 33: 19.

"He that is our God is the God of salvation; and unto God the Lord belong the issues from death." Ps. 68: 20.

Again an effort is made to make the word grave pass as a synonym of death and destruction.

"The Lord killeth and maketh alive; he bringeth down to the grave and bringeth up." I Sam. 2: 6.

"As the cloud is consumed and vanisheth away, so he that goeth down to the grave shall come up no more." Job 7: 9.

"If I wait the grave is mine house." Job 17: 13.

"O Lord, thou hast brought up my soul from the grave; thou hast kept me alive that I should not go down to the pit." Ps. 30: 3.

"But God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave, for he shall receive me." Ps. 49: 15.

"For my soul is full of troubles and my life draweth nigh unto the grave." Ps. 88: 3.

"What man is he that liveth and shall not see death? Shall he deliver his soul from the hand of the grave?" Ps. 89: 48.

"I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death; O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction." Hos. 13: 14.

"Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice." John 5: 28.

Finally as a crowning citation the advocates of the sleep of the soul point the dissenter to the words of the apostle Paul: "Keep this commandment without spot, unrebukable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, which in his times he shall show, who is the blessed and only potentate, the king of kings, and lord of lords, who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen nor can see; to whom be honor and power everlasting, Amen." I Tim. 6: 14-16.

Taken alone, torn away from the rest of Scripture, these passages which speak of death, destruction and the grave as one and the same thing, make the position on Bible ground that at death man practically ceases to exist, very plausible. And,

furthermore, the materialistic argument is very strongly in its favor, but it proves too much. Even the disciples of William Coward refuse to accept the ultimate conclusions of materialism. What are some of the facts to which we may incidentally allude in support of the belief that consciousness ceases at death?

Climatic conditions and changes exert a marked influence upon mankind. It is an admitted fact that all the great events of history which in any eminent degree contributed to the progress of the race, all the upward movements of the human family intellectually, politically and religiously, have taken place almost wholly within the limits of the North Temperate Zone. Thus we are led to believe that a mean temperature, a moderate degree of both heat and cold, is most favorable to physical and mental exercise. A vicious life, indulgence in gross wrongs against the body, not only narrow the intellect but darken and destroy it. The practice of virtue creates the expression of innocence and purity. Bodily conditions have an undoubted influence in determining mental states. Organic changes, say in the functions of the brain, reflect upon consciousness, judgment, reason and volition. The surroundings of life, social relations, methods of training, physical and moral injuries play a prominent part in calling forth or suppressing the peculiar characteristics that men bring with them into the world. Insufficient physical groundwork, as a rule, defeats the normal development of nature. This is nowhere so strikingly illustrated as in the offspring of wicked, intemperate, immoral men and women.

The arguments of a certain school of scientists belonging to our time also seem to lend color of truth to the idea that man loses all knowledge of himself in the event of death. Herbert Spencer explains the phenomenon of personality and memory by a series of conscious states that date from the present in a decreasing ratio back to the beginnings of individual existence.*

The celebrated Alexander Bain, in his work on "Mind

* Herbert Spencer, *Psychology*.

and Body," says: * "Of mind apart from body we have no direct experience and absolutely no knowledge. The wind may act upon the sea and the waves may react upon the wind, yet the agents are known in separation, they are seen to exist apart before the shock of collision; but we are not allowed to perceive a mind acting apart from its material companion. In the second place, we have every reason for believing that there is, in company with all our mental processes, AN UNBROKEN MATERIAL SUCCESSION. From the ingress of a sensation, to the outgoing responses in action, the mental succession is not for an instant dissevered from a physical succession. A new prospect bursts upon the view; there is a mental result of sensation, emotion, thought—terminating in outward displays of speech and gesture. Parallel to this mental series is the physical series of facts, the successive agitation of the physical organs, called the eye, the retina, the optic nerve, optic centres, cerebral hemispheres, outgoing nerves and muscles. While we go the round of the mental circle of sensation, emotion and thought, there is an unbroken physical circle of effects."

The German philosopher Lotze, in speaking of the soul as the bearer of the inner experiences of life, says: "If an admission is demanded of us that every substance must be essentially indestructible, we are compelled to grant the correctness of the conception, but we will no longer include the soul in this category. Nothing justifies us in maintaining the idea that what IS, must necessarily always be." Further on, in the same paragraph, Lotze seems to favor the doctrine of conditional immortality. He says: "That will continue to exist forever, which, by reason of its worth and inherent purpose, is a permanent member of the order of nature, a fixed link in the universe. All else that lacks this perpetuating worth, will pass away."† The views of Victor Hugo, on immortality, were molded much after this fashion, but he decidedly repudiated the so-called sleep of the soul.

* Bain, *Mind and Body*, p. 130.

† Lotze, *Microcosm*, vol. I. p. 439.

Here, then, we substantially have the argument of believers in what is denominated the Abrahamic faith, accompanied by an incidental support from materialistic science and a certain phase of philosophical research, which, on the one hand, proves too much, and, on the other, is merely a wise conjecture.

Does the Bible sustain the position? Do the Scriptures contain any evidence of any weight in favor of the doctrine of immortality? Let us examine the record.

The Apostle John says: "God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth."* In the light of this declaration, which by our opponents is admitted to be inspired, we must place a spiritual interpretation upon the words: "So God created man in His own image; in the image of God created He him."† That is to say, the language of the writer of Genesis can, with no show of reason or support from revelation, be applied to the physical organism of man. It is not the body, but the mind, the intellectual side of man, that bears the image of the Creator. The image of God in us lies in the power of choice, in the reason, in conscious personality. The bodily organism serves as the instrument of communication with physical surroundings. Such is not necessarily the case with God. "When the Lord spake to you out of the midst of the fire, you heard the sound of words; but you saw no similitude."‡ In the image of this unseen speaker man was created. "And the Lord God formed man out of the dust of the ground, and breathed into him the breath of life, and man became a living soul."§ The act of creation consisted in the building of an outward frame, a similitude, a visible, tangible form, perhaps through a process of evolution, and in infusing it with life—a life that partook of the Divine, inasmuch as it was the image of God. This is in striking harmony with the teaching of the author of the Book of Job: "The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life."||

Surely the Old Testament gives us good ground for holding

* John 6: 24. † Gen. 1: 27. ‡ Deut. 4: 12. § Gen. 2: 7. || Job 33: 4.

that man is more than a mere outward physical appearance destitute of a spiritual background. This being true, what are we to think of death, of destruction, of the grave and of sleep, as applied to dissolution? If it was not the original intention of God, in the creation of man as a *living* soul, that he should die, why did he begin to die? What is the nature and meaning of death? Do the Scriptures offer us any answer to these momentous questions? May not the idea of retribution be inseparably associated with the great destroyer of men and nations, who has converted this earth into a vast charnel-house, and filled the centuries with forgotten epitaphs and crumbled tombs? What is the *morale* of death?

The creation of man consisting, according to the Scriptures, in vivifying a human body with the breath of God, then death, in its physical aspect, must be a withdrawal of the living soul from the body. "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit to God who gave it."* "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints."† "And Enoch walked with God, and he was not, for God took him."‡ But it is not sufficient to know that the Scriptures justify the definition of death which we have presented. If we were to go no further, the use of the words *destroy* and *grave* could not be accounted for, nor could we thus obtain a proper idea of immortality. There is a moral reason which, as a cause, lies back of death, and to this we appeal in proof of the fact that it comprehends more than physical dissolution, even more than temporary or final extinction. The retributive idea that accompanies death finds utterance in many a passage of the Old Testament, and the declarations of the New are clear and unmistakable. "And unto this people thou shalt say, Thus saith the Lord: Behold, I set before you the *way* of life and the *way* of death."§ "Say unto them, As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live: turn ye, turn ye from

* Eccl. 12: 7. † Ps. 116: 15. ‡ Gen. 5: 24. (Compare Job 7: 21 with Gen. 5: 24.)

‡ Jer. 21: 8.

your evil ways; for why will ye die, O house of Israel?" *
 "The wicked is driven away in his wickedness; but the righteous hath hope in his death." † "Treasures of wickedness profit nothing; but righteousness delivereth from death." ‡

Turning to the New Testament, we find still stronger evidence in support of the idea that some principle which precedes it determines the meaning of death. "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul, but rather fear Him who is able to destroy both body and soul in hell." § "Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin. Now, if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with Him." || "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." ¶ Evidently in the light of these passages we are compelled to seek refuge in some other theory than that advanced by the advocates of the so-called Abrahamic faith. The words *death* and *life*, *release* and *destruction*, are interchanged. Sometimes death is life; sometimes life is death. The conclusion forces itself upon us that the plain Scriptural idea, when, in its application to man, it has reference to his ways, his walk and conversation, the moral condition of his heart, the spiritual relations of his personality, does not mean the suspension of all conscious existence either for the good or for the bad. It describes a passing away from the scenes of this world, a severing of connections that exist here and an immediate entrance into a state of being in which existence, though disembodied, may be life, and life may be death. The

* Ezek. 33: 11.

† Prov. 14: 32.

‡ Prov. 10: 2.

§ Matt. 10: 28.

|| Rom. 6: 6, 7, 8.

¶ Rom. 5: 12. Compare Ezek. 18: 4: "Behold, all souls are mine; the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine; the soul that sinneth it shall die. But if a man be just and do that which is lawful and right, . . . hath walked in my statutes, and hath kept my judgments, to deal truly, he is just, he shall surely live, saith the Lord God."

former marks the condition of the just, the latter that of the lost.* According to the Scriptures, the moral cause of death is sin, the abandonment of the law and the loss of the knowledge of God whereby mankind became corrupted both physically and spiritually.† Death is simply the sequel of sin. "The wages of sin is death." If such were not the case, it would be impossible to explain the mission of the Messiah, Jesus of Nazareth.

All true Christian believers are united in the conviction that the Saviour of mankind, in His life and teachings, offers a sufficient mediatorial service to the world. He represented Himself as being the bread of life. He claimed to have broken the bonds of death and the power of the Evil One. If His mission touched simply embodied existence in the form in which we find it displayed in earthly man, then it was and is a momental failure. But the work of Christ does not address itself to the fact of physical death alone, nor to supposed extinction following it. It reaches far deeper—to conditions of sin, to the cause of death that may even reign here on earth in moving, breathing form. For does not St. Paul cry out: "Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light?" ‡ It is not at a lifeless and entombed body, but into the open sepulchre of self-conscious iniquity, that he, in his intense zeal for salvation, hurls this apostolic command. Notwithstanding the all-sufficient work of Christ, for eighteen hundred years His most trusted followers and faithful disciples have fallen before the hoary reaper.

If we look around us we can see that the harvest still continues. Are we to give death an all-important place in the career of the righteous as if it were even to them the portal of long unnumbered ages of unconsciousness and practical extinction? No, never! Christ Himself reiterates the utterance of God, bringing forward into the New the testimony of the Old Testament. "I am the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob. God is not the God of the dead but of

* Rom. 11: 6.

† Matt. 9: 5, 6.

‡ Eph. 5: 14.

the living."* Neither are we to look upon the resurrection as the rebeginning of the consciousness that was suspended at death. In death the soul becomes disembodied and in the resurrection reassumes an outward similitude. "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens."† "For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart and to be with Christ which is far better."‡ "Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether it be by life or by death. For to me to live is Christ and to die is gain."§ Will any one say that these passages are not conclusive in their testimony concerning the future life? If the inspired language of St. Paul is more dogmatic and less weighty than that of Christ, we need but to turn to the parable of the rich man and Lazarus for a glimpse into the future state of the soul. The objection might be offered that even the language used by the Saviour is figurative and does not intend to give a full conception of the future world. Let us allow the admission. One truth, however, it surely establishes despite all figure of speech. This parable teaches us that there exists an intermediate state in which the spirits of both good and bad *consciously* abide for a time, the wicked being able to deplore but not to correct the mistakes and sins committed in the body.|| In addition to the lesson contained in this parable concerning the state of the soul after death, we are taught by St. Peter, in his first epistle, a writing of unquestionable authenticity, that Christ Himself when He expired upon the cross, passed into that intermediate state of which He had spoken to His disciples and to the Jews, to await His resurrection from the tomb.¶ And we have reason

* Math. 22: 32. † II Cor. 5: 1-9. ‡ Phil. 1: 23. § Phil. 1: 20, 21.

|| Dives must have been in conscious torment to be able to address a prayer for mercy to the father of the faithful in whose seed all the nations of the earth are blessed. "He said: Nay father Abraham, but if one went unto them from the dead, they will repent. And he said unto him: If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead." Luke 16: 19-31. (Trench, Parables of Our Lord, p. 469.)

¶ I Pet. 3: 18, 19, 20. Comp. Farrar, Early Christianity, p. 110.

to maintain that the teaching of Jesus touching the future fortune of all souls did not arouse the antagonism of the Jewish nation, with the single exception of the Sadducean sect, because history from other sources proves that faith in an immediate and continued existence of the soul after death was not only time-honored among the Hebrews, but firmly rooted in their hearts even in the days of Christ, despite all the degeneracy of the age.*

Now if we continue our inquiry into Scriptural teaching concerning a spiritual realm into which men pass at death, we meet with recorded glimpses of the higher life, with ecstasies, with spiritualistic revelations and angelic appearances. Isaiah saw the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple.† St. Stephen, the martyr, when suffering a most painful death at the hands of his enemies,‡ “being full of the Holy Ghost, looked up steadfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God and Jesus standing at the right hand of God, and said, Behold, I see the heavens opened and the Son of Man standing at the right hand of God.” The apostle Paul had a vision of the heavenly Jerusalem. “And I knew such a man (whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell, God knoweth,) how that he was caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter.”§ St. John also bears testimony to an ecstatic uplifting of the soul: “I was in the Spirit on the Lord’s day, and heard behind me a great voice, as of a trumpet.”||

* “Do not you know that those who depart out of this life, according to the law of nature, and pay that debt which was received from God, when he that lent it us is pleased to require it back again, enjoy eternal fame; that their houses and their posterity are sure, that their souls are pure and obedient, and obtain a most holy place in heaven, from whence in the revolution of ages, they are again sent into pure bodies; while the souls of those whose hands have acted madly against themselves are received by the darkest places in Hades, and while God, who is their Father, punishes those that offend against either of them in their posterity; for which reason God hates such doings.” Josephus, Wars of the Jews, Book III., chap. 8, sec. 5.

† Isa. 6: 1-5.

‡ Acts 7: 55-57. Compare Acts 7: 59, 60.

§ II Cor. 12: 3, 4.

|| Rev. 1: 10.

In ancient times there existed the same degrading practice that men follow now, the practice of seeking counsel from familiar spirits through the agency of mediums. The wretched and cowardly Saul, having been abandoned by God, as a last resort to discover what would be the out-come of his conflict with the Philistines, sought the witch of En-dor, to communicate with the spirit of Samuel. The woman in the midst of her incantations uttered a cry of terror and turning to the cringing king of Israel, upbraided him for his deception. She had been surprised in her own arts. The witch evidently was an impostor—for all witchcraft is imposture and can only be exercised among superstitious people—else such great terror would not have seized her at sight of the mantled form of Samuel. "What she could never, herself, have done, was divinely vouchsafed." * Thus, whatever interpretation we place upon this narrative; whether we hold to its literal truth,† or whether we claim that the sin committed by Saul consisted in his lending recognition to a practice forbidden by the religion of the Old Testament,‡ we are here brought into immediate contact, historically, with the realm of spirits.

The announcement of the birth of Christ by angelic messengers, the transfiguration of our Saviour on the mount, the appearance of Moses and Elias so that they were recognized by the disciples, the presence of an angel in the wilderness of temptation and during the agonies of Gethsemane, and the ascension of the risen Lord into heaven can but deepen the conviction many entertain that the single step between man and the grave only symbolizes the nearness of a higher world into which believers pass by the transitional stage of physical death.

This then is the Bible argument in favor of the universal faith of the Christian Church in immortality, not the immortality of continued existence only, but that of rewards and pun-

* Parker, *People's Bible*, I Sam. 28: 7: p. 50.

† Geikie, *Hours with the Bible*, Vol. III., 119.

‡ Herzog, *Real-Encyclopedia*, Vol. IV., art. Ender.

ishments, of eternal life and everlasting death, of salvation and destruction.*

As Christians we believe that all true religious light is a revelation and a gift from God through Jesus Christ the Lord. But we do not therefore ignore the judgment of reason in support of any one article of the faith, or of religion as a whole. Whilst philosophy and science are divided on all subjects upon which they touch, and not on anything so much as upon the nature and destiny of man, they bear testimony favorable to the aspirations of the soul after a higher mode of existence.

Leibnitz and Decartes believed in the immortality of the soul. Voltaire, the great French infidel, paid the following tribute to the mission of Jesus: "He who alone was to instruct all men, came and condemned the three sects of the Jews; but without him we could never have known anything of our soul; for the philosophers never had any determinate idea of it; and Moses—the only true law-giver in the world before our own—Moses, who talked with God face to face, left men in the most profound ignorance on this great point. It is then only for seventeen hundred years that there has been any certainty of the soul's existence and its immortality."†

A rationalist one day said to Victor Hugo: "So am I a believer to some extent, but surely the out-casts of society can have no faith in their own immortality." To this remark the poet replied: "Perhaps they believe in it more than you do." On another occasion Victor Hugo said to Arsène Houssaye: "I am conscious myself of the certainty of a future life. Just as in a forest that is perpetually felled, young sprouts start up with renewed vigor, so my thoughts ever rise higher and higher, towards the infinite; the earth affords me her generous sap, but the heaven irradiates me with the light of half-seen worlds. The nearer I approach my end, the clearer do I hear the

* "And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off; it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched, where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched." Mark 9: 43, 44.

† Voltaire, *Philosophical Dictionary*, art. Soul, p. 383.

immortal symphonies of worlds that call me to themselves. For half a century I have been outpouring my volumes of thought in prose and verse, in history, philosophy, drama, romance, ode and ballad, yet I appear to myself not to have said a thousandth part of what is within me; and when I am laid in the tomb I shall not reckon that my life is finished. The grave is not a cul-de-sac; it is an avenue. Death is the sublime prolongation of life, not its dreary finish. It closes on the twilight, it opens in the dawn. My work is only begun; I yearn for it to become higher and nobler; and this craving for the infinite demonstrates that there is an infinity." *

The favorite theme of Jean Paul was the Immortality of the Soul. In his *Selina* the following passage occurs: "With what shall we compare the act of dying? With the gentle approach of sleep, or with the sudden return of consciousness? A clairvoyant also passes into hypnotic sleep with yawning and rubbing of the eyes. When the last stages of physical dissolution have involved the inner organs of life, not as at the end of sleep, either natural or hypnotic, why should not the soul be drawn by a rapid flight into another sphere of being? Too often a gradual progression in Nature is taken for granted. Consider the magic stroke that in an instant starts a new life with all its future determination. Hitherto all the parts were present, but each part was its own whole and a new whole had to be created. But by whom? By a single spiritual being. Thus about the naked disembodied spirit there lie the high elemental worlds of ether and warmth and one moment suffices to surround it, through its unknown powers, with a new raiment of life." †

Though materialistic thinkers like Feuerbach, Buechner and Haeckel may deny the existence of God and the immortality of the soul, science as a whole does not tend that way. Professor Huxley in a late work treats of what he calls the three great achievements of modern times in the study of natural philoso-

* Victor Hugo and His Time, p. 94.

† Jean Paul, Works, vol. 61, p. 349.

phy, namely: the molecular constitution of matter, the conservation of energy and evolution. In respect of the second, the correlation and conservation of energy, an established law of science, he quotes, by way of definition, the language of the late Clerk Maxwell: "The total energy of any body or system of bodies is a quantity which can neither be increased nor diminished by any mutual action of such bodies, though it may be transformed into any one of the forms of which energy is susceptible." "It follows that energy," says Huxley, "is indestructible in nature." *

According to this law then, whether the soul be corporeal, a material substance, as many of the Church Fathers taught, or incorporeal, a spiritual energy, as the Christian Church to-day almost universally believes, it is indestructible. †

But Huxley goes further; he says: "That a particular mode of molecular motion does give rise to a state of consciousness is experimentally certain; but the how and why of the process are just as inexplicable as in the case of the communication of kinetic energy." In other words, he declares the existence of a background of mystery that dissociates mental energy and molecular motion, a background in which the facts of consciousness rest.

But what is the testimony of history concerning the belief in a future state? The statement made by the disciples of William Coward that the doctrine of immortality, commonly held by Christians, originated among Pagan nations, is not true. ‡ The

* *Advance of Science in Last Half Century*, pp. 40, 85.

† "Matter is but the generalized name we give to those modifications which we refer immediately to an unknown something outside of ourselves. . . . In the deepest sense all that we really know is mind, and as Clifford would say, what we call the material universe is simply an imperfect picture in our minds of a real universe of mind-stuff."—Fiske, "Idea of God," p. 153.

‡ "When Plato says: Responsibility lies with him that chooses, God is blameless; he has it from Moses who is much older than all Grecian writers. Whenever philosophers and poets have said anything about immortality, punishment after death and such like teachings, their information came chiefly from the prophets."—Justin Martyr, *First Apology*, § 57.

heathen philosophers of antiquity were as much divided upon this momentous question, as the great and small thinkers have been who have flourished since the introduction of Christianity. Among the Greeks, Epicurus doubted the immortality of the soul, while Socrates expressed faith in the doctrine and Plato was charged with separating the soul entirely from the body so that it vanished into thin air. Aristotle, whose philosophy for centuries ruled the world of thought and influenced the dogmatists of the Church, first ascribed independent faculties to the soul and undertook to define them. Among the Romans, Cicero and Cæsar, two of the most influential spirits in the Roman world, doubted and denied existence after death.

Thus we see that the belief in immortality is not of heathen origin any more than belief in the supernatural.* We must trace it back to a law of man's being which asserts itself under all circumstances, sometimes strongly, sometimes vaguely. The charge that that belief was borrowed from heathenism therefore ends in error. The fact that faith in immortality forms a part of man's nature, whether Heathen, Jewish or Christian, converts the doctrine of the *Thnetopsychitæ* as it is offered to us by its modern advocates, into a dogmatic hybrid, an innovation, an invention neither Pagan nor Christian.

The universal faith of the early Christians touching the state of the soul after death, offers strong testimony against the so-called belief in the sleep of the soul. For evidently that belief, expressed and preserved in the inscriptions found in the catacombs, was traditional. It came down from the days of the Apostles. The early Christians, without the least compunction,

* "The necessity of immortality impresses itself more strongly through the necessity of love. Christianity and the refinement of the heart and mind have increased the warmth of love and raised it to a virtue. Therefore one can more readily comprehend why in former colder times whole sects like the Sadducees, denied immortality, and moreover why the greater portion of the Greek philosophers spoke of it with indifference."—Jean Paul, Works, vol. 61, p. 289.

introduced prayers for the dead into the church service.* It was a universal custom among them for the friends and relatives of departed ones to annually commemorate their death by the celebration of the Lord's Supper, in order to bind themselves anew to the Saviour of mankind.† In connection therewith, prayers were offered for the peace of the departed, for their growth in happiness and for their final glorious resurrection.

In addition to all that has been said we might speak, at length, of the visions of the dying, if any instances that could be cited would serve to fortify more strongly than does Revelation itself, the universal faith of Christendom in the immortality of the soul. Therefore the mention of but two remarkable death-bed scenes will suffice. Jacob Boehme, the great German mystic, "the mighty cobbler of Goerlitz" († 1625), when dying said to his son: "Do you hear that sweet harmonious music?" "No," the boy replied. "Open the door," said Boehme, "that you may the better hear it." De Quincey, whose writings will be read as long as the English language lives, before he passed away, had been in a doze for some hours; and as it had been observed that in his waking hours since the beginning of his illness he had reverted much to the incidents of his childhood and talked especially of his father, regretting that he had known so little of him, so in his final doze his mind seemed to be wandering among the same old memories. "My dear, dear mother: then I was greatly mistaken," he was heard to murmur; and his very last act was to

* The practice of praying for the dead is really older than the Christian Church, and not having been condemned by Christ or His apostles, certainly testifies to the fact that both the Saviour and His followers believed in immortality. "And when he (Judas the warrior) had made a gathering throughout the company to the sum of two thousand drachms of silver, he sent it to Jerusalem to offer a sin-offering, doing therein very well and honestly in that he was mindful of the resurrection; for if he had not hoped that they that were slain, should have risen again, it had been superfluous and vain to pray for the dead. And also in that he perceived that there was great favor laid up for those that died godly."—2 Macc. 12: 43-45.

† 1 Cor. 10: 16.

throw up his arms and utter, as if with a cry of surprised recognition, "Sister! sister! sister!" The vision seemed to be that of his sister Elizabeth, dead near Manchester seventy years before, and now waiting for him on the banks of the river.*

We conclude with the words of Carlyle: "If all things are discerned by us and exist for us in an element of time, and therefore of mortality and mutability; yet Time itself reposes on Eternity; the truly Great and Transcendental has its basis and substance in Eternity; stands revealed to us as Eternity in a vesture of Time. Thus in all Poetry, Worship, Art, Society, as one form passes into another, nothing is lost; it is but the superficial, as it were the body only, that grows obsolete and dies; under the mortal body lies a soul which is immortal; which anew incarnates itself in fairer revelations; and the Present is the living sum total of the whole Past."

"Light has come into the world; to such as love Light, so as Light must be loved, with a boundless all-doing, all-enduring love. . . . Do we not already know that the name of the Infinite is Good, is God? Here on earth we are as soldiers, fighting in a foreign land; that understand not the plan of the campaign, and have no need to understand it; seeing well what is at our hand to be done. Let us do it like soldiers, with submission, with courage, with a heroic joy. 'Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with all thy might.' Behind us, behind each one of us, lie six thousand years of human effort, human conquest; before us is the boundless Time, with its as yet uncreated and unconquered Continents and Eldorados, which we, *even we*, have to conquer, to create; and from the bosom of Eternity there shine for us celestial guiding stars." †

* English Men of Letters, De Quincey, p. 133.

† Carlyle, *Essays*, vol. 1, pp. 42, 46.

IV.

THE DOCTRINAL CONFESSIONS: THEIR WANE.

BY REV. J. C. BOWMAN, A.M.

ANY one who is familiar with the bearings of Christian science cannot fail to notice that the former tendency to fixedness has fully surrendered to the spirit of change.

Theological thought cannot, as formerly, find rest in established systems; and doctrinal conceptions have undergone, and are still undergoing, such modifications that the old formularies can no longer serve as adequate standards.

It is manifest that the Confessions, once so precious to their zealous adherents, who contended for them as for their life, are on the wane.

These strongly marked changes in the religious thought of the age are not the result of a simply negatory tendency, but indicate a steady advance on the part of the Church towards clearer, broader, and more adequate conceptions of the truth.

The giving way of old systems of doctrinal belief to new forms of thought does not, therefore, justify the fear sometimes expressed, that the power of Christian faith is waning, and that there is a corresponding diminution of loyalty to truth. It indicates rather a changed method of viewing Christian doctrines, which is far in advance of that which it replaces, being broader, less constrained, and truer to the teachings of the Word of God; and, at the same time, it gives evidence that the true relation which holds between faith and doctrine is coming to be more fully recognized and appreciated.

In the discussion of the theme :Doctrinal Confessions, and their Wane, it is important that at the outstart we clearly dis-

tinguish between the CREED of the Church and the CONFESSIONS of the Church. Too frequently the terms are used synonymously and interchangeably, thereby causing confusion of thought as to the rightful place which faith and doctrine hold in the domain of religion, and as to the proper relation they sustain to each other.

THE CREED OF THE CHURCH.

The Church has one Creed, but many Confessions. This categorical statement may serve well to give due prominence to the distinction which should be clearly kept in mind.

The Creed (*Credo*) is a rule of faith which sets forth, with authority, certain fundamental articles of belief which are regarded as essential to the salvation of the individual, and to the well-being of the Church. It is not the product of controversy, not a peace-formulary which shall bind together those who, without such consensus, might be divided; but it is a *fructus* which emanates from the inner life of the Church, and which every branch of the Vine claims and cherishes as its own. What is known by pre-eminence as the Creed of Christians is the common property of the Church Catholic, and therefore a bond of union between all ages and sections of Christendom. As man's response to Divine revelation, it has to do exclusively with the contents and order of revelation. It is not a summary of doctrines which exhibits the mind of the Church in its apprehension of truth, or error; but, in distinction from this, a summary of what the heart believes unto righteousness, and of what the mouth confesses unto salvation. Its contents do not appear in the form of logical statement or doctrinal definition, but in the form of verities which admit neither of question nor controversy.

The articles of the Creed are articles of and for faith: a formulary of living facts and saving truths.

As Christianity presupposes faith, so does faith necessitate a Creed, a formulated confession of faith. The Church, therefore, has never been without a Creed. *

* *Creeds of Christendom*, Schaff. Vol. 1, p 5, *et seq.*

Even before the Christian Church was established there was need of the confession of Peter (Matt. 6: 16), which is the nucleus of all the œcumenical creeds.

At first the Creed was embodied in the living words of the Apostles who communicated to others what they had received from the Divine Teacher Himself. Soon after the time of the Apostles, the faith was formulated in brief, and, in most instances, fragmentary summaries. The recently discovered *Didache* is one of the earliest and best specimens.

At a later day the so-called Apostles' Creed came into general use. Starting with the confession of Peter (its Trinitarian order probably determined by the baptismal formula) it assumed, by gradual enlargement, its present form not earlier than the close of the fifth century. Although it is known as the Apostles' Creed (*Symbolum Apostolicum*) it cannot be traced either to an individual author, or to a particular Council of the Church.

How it came to be we do not know. It grew; it was not made. Unlike all other symbols which were the product mainly of one mind, even when composed by committees or councils, the Apostles' Creed grew out of the general life of the early Christian Church, slowly and mysteriously, as the fragrant flower develops from the seed and plant. Instead, however, of being less authoritative because of its obscure origin, it is more authoritative for the reason that it voices the faith of the whole Church. It stands as the ripened product of the ecclesiastical inspiration of the first four centuries, and satisfies, as no other symbol, the faith-intuitions of all Christians. Notwithstanding its brevity, it contains all the fundamental articles of the Christian faith, and serves as a common ground on which all believers in the essential facts of the Christian religion can meet. It is the seed from which all other creeds have grown, and the foundation upon which all the whole after-structure of symbolic literature rests.*

While it may be maintained that the Creed is essential to the

* Dr. Shedd, *Hist. Christ. Doctr.* II., 433.

organization and continuance of the Church, it does not follow that the Church is founded on symbols. The Church is founded on Christ as confessed by men. The Creed is, therefore, continuous with the life of the Church. It may be obscured but it cannot wane. While the Church lives the Creed will live, and will withstand every assault that may be made against it.

THE RISE AND GROWTH OF CONFESSIONS.

Besides the Apostles' Creed, are the other two œcumenical symbols known as the Nicene Creed and Athanasian Creed.

Along with these may be mentioned, also, the Christological statement of the Council of Chalcedon.

These symbols occupy a middle ground between the Creed and the Confession, partaking largely of the nature of both.

They develop more fully and interpret the simple factual statements of the Apostles' Creed, and embody the results of the great doctrinal controversies of the Nicene and Post-Nicene ages. Whilst we would not disparage the great value and merits of these faith-standards, and their important service to early Christianity in preserving the purity of the faith, yet one feels in the study and use of them, that they reveal a contrast with the spirit of the Apostles' Creed which puts them on a lower plane. It is true that they set forth the articles of faith in the form of fact rather than dogma, and in so far they are consistent with the Creed-idea. But the beginnings of the Confessional idea may be distinctly traced in the manifest tendency toward enlarged doctrinal statement. Nor does the enlargement of the Confession bring with it a corresponding enlargement of faith and truth. On the contrary, the added doctrinal definitions, while they give prominence to essential truths in opposition to existing heresies, at the same time intrench upon the largeness of truth and freedom of faith which appear in the simpler form of statement of the Apostles' Creed.

Moreover, the seal of Synods becomes the badge of a party. The Creed, confessionalized, becomes a wedge not only to divide orthodoxy from heterodoxy, but also Christian from Christian.

The Creed of the Church becomes the Creed of *Nicea*, born of controversy, and bearing the signatures of 318 bishops, all of whom, with but one exception, represent Eastern Christianity in distinction from Western.

It may also be observed that the spirit of uncharitableness which, as doctrinal history proves, generally follows closely along the lines of the confessional tendency, already asserts itself in the conclusion of the Nicene Creed, which, in its original form, contained an anathema against Christian brethren.

The so-called Athanasian Creed, while it was "a triumphant psalm of the orthodox faith," setting forth elaborately the doctrine of the Trinity, and defining more fully the doctrine of the person and nature of Christ, in opposition to the Apollinarian, Nestorian, and Eutychian heresies, yet, so far as the essential articles of faith are concerned, it was no advance upon the briefer and simpler statements of previously existing Creeds. The faith-contents, it is true, are firmly held, but they are so thickly enveloped by doctrinal definitions that one cannot but feel that the Creed-idea has been largely sacrificed to that of doctrinal standard.

Whatever of truth the Athanasian Creed brought to the orthodox party, it added nothing to the faith of the Church.

And surely its three-fold anathema against all who refuse to accept its dogmas, reveals a spirit which is in strong contrast with the uncontroversial and peaceful tone of the Apostles' Creed, and can hardly be said to be consistent with Christian charity and humility.

Unfortunately the liberal, irenic spirit of the Creed, which invites and unites all upon its broad, common basis, does not, as already suggested, accompany the tendency to doctrinal confessionalism. As this latter tendency develops in the history of the Church, there is a corresponding tendency to exclusivism and uncharitableness.

The Creed satisfies itself with *truth*, and contains naught but blessings. Doctrinal Confessions look as intently toward heresy as toward the truth, and are as ready to curse as to bless.

The characteristic features briefly referred to as distinguishing Confessions from what may properly be designated as the true Creed of the Church, become still more apparent in the doctrinal standards which follow the œcumenical confessions. These embrace (1). The symbols of the Greek or Oriental Church, in which the Greek faith is set forth in distinction from that of the Roman Catholic and the Protestant Churches. They differ from the Roman standards mainly in the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit, and the more important doctrine of the papacy. (2). The symbols of the Roman Catholic Church, from the Council of Trent to the Council of the Vatican, which sanction the distinctive doctrines of Romanism, and condemn the leading principles of evangelical Protestantism. (3). The symbols of the Protestant Church, which are the most numerous, and are subdivided into Lutheran and Reformed. These date from 1530, and may be said to close with the middle of the seventeenth century. They agree in their principal tenets, but differ in their doctrines of the Divine decrees, and of the nature and efficacy of the sacraments, especially the mode of Christ's presence in the Lord's Supper, together with minor divergences.*

It is not to the present purpose to lay emphasis upon the contrast which holds between these various doctrinal standards or to discuss their respective merits or deficiencies.

Although the contrast between the Creed of the Church and doctrinal Confessions has been presented to the decided advantage of the former, it has not been argued that the latter have no rightful place in the history of the Church and in the progress of Christianity. Whatever evils have followed in the train of doctrinal symbols, the validity of the principle underlying the confessional standard may not be questioned.

The Church has one Creed, but many Confessions.

The double statement is repeated with the view to show that

* *Creeds of Christendom*, Vol. I., p. 10; also, *Schaff's Herzog Ency.* Vol. I., p. 571.

its parts do not stand in opposition, but in harmonious correlation.

There is one Creed because there is but one faith. That is to say, the contents of the Christian faith are the absolutely essential and unchangeable facts of our holy religion, which are accepted by all who believe.

But the contents of faith address themselves to man's intellectual nature as well as to his faith-faculty.

The very suggestion of a conflict between faith and reason, implies a misconception of human personality as well as of religion. Whenever the attempt is made to set the two at war, both faith and reason protest against the divorce as being no less unnatural than it is unchristian; and they combine in contending against those who disregard their respective rightful claims, allowing no man to put asunder what God has joined together. The Christian thinks as well as believes. There is, therefore, a Christian Science as well as a Christian Creed. But, unlike the Creed which changes not, for the reason that the contents do not change, Christian Science varies with the varying apprehensions of men.

It may be claimed that truth also, in a certain sense, is unchangeable. Truth, as to its essence, as a living spiritual power flowing from the person of our Lord, is the same for all men; but, as apprehended by the intelligence, it is expressed in endless variety.

The Apostles, though inspired, did not apprehend truth in the same manner. The Fathers, the Reformers, and the representative minds of all ages, illustrate the same law of diversity in the apprehension of truth. These differences of apprehension are due both to historical conditions and to individual temperament. No man sees truth in the same manner as another sees it. No age looks at the same phases of truth, or precisely from the same view-point, as another age.

When we consider the vastness of truth and its illimitable comprehensiveness, and then, by way of contrast, consider what at best can be but partial and imperfect views of truth, which

mark any particular age, we at once see how contradictory is the assumption that any Dogmatic System can be so rounded and complete as to preclude any further advance in Christian science.

That the Church has many Confessions, differing as men's minds and the processes of intellection differ, differing as the spirit and needs of one age differ from those of another, does not conflict with the idea of the unity of the faith, or the essential oneness of the truth.

Surely it can be no mystery that the Confessions of the several periods of the Church's history bear the impress of their age, and present such phases of truth as would naturally be developed out of the historical forces and conditions peculiar to the age.

At first, Christian science arose almost exclusively as a defense against the attacks of Pagan or Jewish civilization, and therefore assumed the character of apologetics, which it retained down to the fourth century. After Christianity became the state religion of the Roman Empire, the scientific spirit, which is always at work in the bosom of the Church, directed itself to the formulation of the Christian dogmas, a task performed through a series of literary controversies running through five centuries.

From the beginning of the ninth century to the close of the fifteenth, was the period of scholasticism, in which all the doctrinal results of the preceding controversies were carefully gathered up and sifted by the Schoolmen, while at the same time the reasoning methods of the Greek philosophy were applied to their exposition.

With the Reformation came a general breaking up of the old systems of thought through the introduction of relatively new principles of truth, which, after the lapse of more than a century, resulted in the establishment of the Protestant Confessions. Christian science, while moving through these various stages of apologetics, polemics, scholasticism, and confessional-

ism, enclosed the whole of Christian truth so far as it existed in the Church in the form of well defined doctrine.*

The history of the confessional tendency, as we have seen, is consistent with the general law of human thought in relation to scientific content. In every department of science it is the tendency of the thought of the age to become crystallized in a system of truth or belief. Christian science conforms to, and illustrates the same law.

But the systematization of thought may carry with it the errors as well as the truth of science. Hence it can readily be accounted for that Christian science, in its efforts to counteract and overcome the peculiar errors of an age, should give prominence to certain phases of truth to the neglect of others equally important, and thus expose itself to the charge of narrowness and onesidedness.

In directing attention to this feature of Christian science, viz., the defective character of all doctrinal Confessions, and more particularly their misapprehension and misapplication, it may be well to preface our strictures with the statement that we are not unmindful of the great service which the Confessions have rendered the Church as safeguards against heresy, and as defenses of the faith once delivered to the saints.

When held in due subordination to the Bible, they serve not only as summaries of the Bible doctrines, but also as aids to their proper understanding, as well as guards against false doctrine and practice. They embody the doctrinal belief of generations and the most valuable results of religious controversies. As Catechisms, they are well-nigh indispensable in the instruction of children; and in the systematic upbuilding of the believer in the faith.†

The use of Confessions, the many benefits claimed for them as pertaining to the past, and the service they may continue to render to the Church within properly prescribed limits, we do not question.

* *Hist. of Christian Doctrines.* Herzog Ency. Vol. I., p. 65.

† *Schaff-Herzog Encyc.*, Vol. I., p. 371.

It is the misapprehension and misapplication of doctrinal Confessions which now engages our attention.

In the thought of many, all the interests and the ultimate destiny of Christianity are inseparably bound up with the particular standard of doctrine which they have come to regard as the *regula fidei* for all ages. To question the tenability of these traditional beliefs, whether *in toto* or in part, is in their minds equivalent to an assault upon Christian truth itself.

Against this spirit of illiberalism and narrowness, a strong reactionary movement has set in. The Christian mind can no longer be bound by ancient limitations. It insists upon being untrammelled by conventional restrictions and by the doctrinal moulds of former generations, which, however well they may have served their purpose in the past, cannot in like manner meet the wants of the present day.*

Granting all the excellencies that may be claimed for the Confessions, it must be evident to any one who has studied the nature of Christian doctrine and its gradual development, that truth, in its fulness, cannot be enclosed in any one or all of the confessional standards, and that a Confession, at best, can exhibit but certain phases of truth made specially prominent because of the peculiar historical conditions of the age in which it was formulated.

The Confessions of the Reformation period all point to certain great errors which were met not simply by negative protest, but by positive doctrinal counter-statement.

The doctrine of Justification by Faith was revived and placed in the ascendant as the most effectual remedy against the Judaizing errors of the Roman Church; whilst the heathenizing or Pelagian tendencies were offset and counteracted by the prominence given to the doctrine of the Divine sovereignty and predestination. How natural it was for the Confessions of the Reformation age to embody and give prominence to the peculiar phases of doctrine which seemed to the mind of the age to

* "The Doctrine of Sacred Scripture," Ladd, Vol. I., Int.

be best suited to counteract and overcome the errors with which it was immediatly confronted!

The great danger to which the Protestant Church was exposed, and to which in some instances it yielded, was that of making these special doctrines unduly prominent by assigning to them a position of centrality in the sphere of theology,—an error which ever since has proved an obstruction to the free course of Christian truth. Furthermore, it will hardly be maintained that the truths made conspicuous during the Reformation and post-Reformation periods are of such imperious nature as to restrain the mind of the Church from the investigation of other truths, which, to say the least, are of paramount importance.

Every age of the Church has its own peculiar needs and problems; but, however fully the needs may be met, and however satisfactorily the problems may be solved, the results of the age, as these may be gathered up in a doctrinal Confession, cannot serve as an adequate standard for the ages that follow. Neither men nor councils, however profound their thought or clear their vision, can fully forecast the issues of the Church of the future, nor can they, by way of anticipation, make provision for its needs.

It is a law of all life that, while the substance remains, old forms pass away to make room for new forms. It is no less a law of the life of truth as it is evolved in the onward history of the Christian Church. In new forms the Church is ever renewing its life. The substance of truth, as enveloped in the imperfect forms of one age, re-appears renewed and enlarged in the forms—still imperfect forms—of a later age. Our very conception of the Church as a Divine-human organic constitution, necessitates the belief that it is ever advancing from a lower to a higher plane; that the horizon of truth is ever enlarging; that the Eternal Spirit is the constant Inspirer and Guide of the Church; so that fuller revelations of truth are being made to the mind of the Church from age to age.

The Latin and Greek Fathers could apprehend so much of

the truth as was adapted to the spiritual aptitude and to the needs of the Church of their day; but they could not think out and formulate the truth for the mind of the Church of all ages. The Reformers and the Councils of the sixteenth century were led by the Spirit into an apprehension and systematization of truth adequate to the needs of the Reformation age; but to attempt to tether the mind and the conscience of the Church of the nineteenth century to what may have been suitable standards for the mind and conscience of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, is to do violence to the very nature of truth and to the free life of Protestant Christianity.

Even for their own age, the inadequacy of the Reformation standards is clearly proven by the fact that the dissensus of belief was as marked as the consensus, and that the Protestant Christian faith demanded for itself wide room for diverse theological opinions. The sharp conflicts which characterized the reign of Protestant scholasticism, during which the various contending sects held up their own doctrinal standard as the supreme test of the whole truth, afford additional proof of the impossibility of embodying a perfectly rounded system of doctrine in any one Confession.

If, then, as we have shown, doctrinal Confessions prove to be imperfect and inadequate moulds for Christian science, even for the several ages which produced them, is it not as absurd as it is illogical to attempt to bind them upon the consciences of generations removed by several centuries?

Such confessional bondage is directly opposed to the Protestant principle, and at once suggests the tyranny of the papal system.

THE WANE OF THE CONFESSIONS.

It is the abuse of the Confessions, and the false principle of interpretation hitherto applied to them, that Protestant Christianity is now called upon to resist and to remedy.

The leaders of thought in the various denominations are coming more and more to feel that while doctrinal standards of

former centuries were well adapted to the wants of the age which produced them, and served well the purposes for which Providence designed them, they fall far short of meeting the wants of our day; and that for any denomination to require of its ministry and laity unqualified subscription to its traditional standard of orthodoxy is to resist both the higher claims of truth and the leadings of Providence.

The age of orthodox confessionalism is fast drawing to a close. The Confessions are on the wane, however loath may be their adherents to acknowledge it.

Nor is this tendency of the mind of the Church the result of a merely negative principle, which would break away from the past because of a lack of reverence for the old, and from a curious desire for that which is new. Rather would we attribute the changed attitude to the introduction and inworking of positive principles which the old forms of truth can no longer embody; and to the appearance of new problems, for the solution of which old doctrinal standards afford little, if any, help.

Some of these problems are not entirely new. They are problems which were supposed to be settled by the fiat of confessional orthodoxy, but now are forcing themselves to the front, through the errors of the past, to be reconsidered in the light of our day, that they may find a broader and truer solution. The spirit of inquiry and deeply searching criticism which characterizes our age, and which some are disposed to regard with grave apprehension, is not born of unbelieving skepticism, but rather of a love of, and yearning for truth, which the deliverances of orthodox confessionalism have failed to satisfy. The present activity on the lines of historical research and criticism is not destined, unless by the fault of the Church itself, to minister to unbelief, but to faith. We have the best ground for confidence that as all sound knowledge tends to true religion, so historical discovery and criticism, the advances of science, the speculations of philosophy, will work together for faith, and aid in removing the misunderstandings which hinder belief.

The essential and absolute truth of Christianity, no discoveries in science, no historical research, no intellectual enlightenment can weaken. Wrought upon by the intensely active critical forces of the age, which are aided by the most thorough scholarship the world has known, the truth will suffer no harm, but will come forth in new and higher forms. Far better that old systems of thought, and theories made venerable by age, should break down under the weight of modern criticism than that aught of truth should be suppressed for lack of a truth-loving and truth-searching spirit.

If then, the old standards fail to serve as adequate guides for the readjustment, or entirely new solution of such problems as the doctrine of Inspiration, the Divine Immanence, the relation of the Natural to the Supernatural, the legitimate claims of Reason in the sphere of Religion, it is because they were not intended for such use.

The Church was not designed to serve Confessions; but it is the province of Confessions to serve the Church. When they fail to do this satisfactorily, then they must give way to new forms of truth which the expanding life of truth and of the Church requires for its fuller expression.

But the Confessions are waning not simply because they fail to serve as correct guides for the re-investigation and readjustment of old problems. New dangers and new problems confront the Church. The powers of evil are massing themselves against the advancing hosts of God's kingdom. The forces of materialism and infidelity are marshalled under new leaders, and assail the Christian faith with changed methods of attack. And while there is so great need of strengthening the defenses of the Church, an unprecedented opportunity is at hand for the more aggressive work of extending the kingdom of Christ through Home and Foreign Missionary agencies. To meet these demands which are challenging the Church with ever-increasing power and persistency, Protestant Christianity is compelled to organize its scattered forces that it may present a united solid front.

The evidences of a general desire on the part of the several branches of Protestant Christianity for a closer union than has hitherto obtained, are too well known to require specific mention. Nor does the desire for such a combination of Christian forces grow out of a mere sentimental longing for Church union, in order that Protestant Christianity may thereby present a better appearance, and be shielded from the reproaches brought against it.

Back of all the questions of expediency and economy lie the solemn issues of the age and the imperative needs of humanity. God is moving in history; and out of the historical exigency is born the spirit of unity which is irresistibly drawing the Churches into closer fellowship. It is the Divine purpose that inspires the human wish.

How the desired unification may best be effected, is the great problem which now confronts the mind and heart of the Church. As yet, only the most cautious, tentative efforts have been made. Across denominational lines hands are being clasped in brotherly love, while hearts are praying that the dividing lines may be obliterated. But dividing lines can be effaced only by means of a unifying bond. What shall that bond be? Not Church Polity. The principle of government must be free, as it has ever been, allowing room for "differences of administration." Besides, a governmental bond is at best formal and mechanical, not sufficiently vital.

No thoughtful mind looks in this direction for the remedy.

Church-Union on the basis of a common worship has much to commend it. The most generally approved forms of worship, such as the hymns and prayers of the Church, are already held as common property, and are in common use. Union on such a basis is, however, impracticable. It would require the abandonment of one or other of the two forms of worship, and, in the nature of the case, it would seem that the free form should be sacrificed to the liturgical.

Such a sacrifice could not be asked consistently with the principle of Protestant Christianity, which has always allowed

the use of both forms. Moreover, the Church is better prepared to-day than ever before to allow the two to exist side by side.

Can the union be effected on the basis of a common doctrinal standard? This, at first, might seem to be at least desirable, if not practicable. It is, however, neither.

To turn back the pages of history with the view to find a doctrinal standard in primitive Christianity, which should be made a basis of a common belief, would be a violation of a fundamental law of the Church's life. Spiritual life and truth move forward, not backward. Repristination is both unhistorical and unnatural, and every attempt along this line is bound to fail. The results of the Tractarian movement serve well to illustrate the invalidity of the principle.

To attempt to unite upon any one of the Reformation symbols would involve the same backward tendency.

It has already been clearly shown that the doctrinal standards of the Reformation period do not forecast or anticipate the needs of the 19th century. Besides, it is doubtful if any denomination would recommend its own Confession as in all respects suitable for a common doctrinal basis.

Denominations have outgrown their Confessions, and are becoming restive under the unhistorical restraints that fetter them. At times they seek to remedy the evil by granting doctrinal indulgences. By many of the denominations it is not regarded as obligatory that every phase of doctrine in the Confession should be held, but only its essential features.

In some instances, what were once held as cardinal tenets, if not openly questioned, have fallen under the ban of silence.

The Hyper-Calvinism of the Confessions of Dort and Westminster is hardly known apart from the archives of the Church.

It reappears at times in theological treatises, and is, perhaps, discussed in some schools of theology, but it has almost entirely disappeared from the pulpit and from popular religious literature. When any doctrine, whether false or true, ceases to be heard from the pulpit, it can no longer retain its hold upon the mind of the people, and may justly be regarded as "a vanishing

quantity in the Christian beliefs of our time."* Practically, if not theoretically, Confessions are treated as the embodiment of the doctrinal views prevalent at certain periods, rather than as a binding authority for all ages. It was doubtless this conviction which recently led the Presbyterian Church † of Scotland and England to resolve to revise the Westminster Confession.

But if no one of the doctrinal standards will answer to the needs of the day, may not a common basis of belief be secured by merging the many Confessions into one, by eliminating all objectionable features, and uniting on such general statements as could readily be accepted? Such a compromise would be characterized by the weakness peculiar to all compromises: it would be yielding much to gain little or nothing.

Furthermore, a new doctrinal standard, if it would have any force whatever, must embody a new principle. This is the defect of all the doctrinal agreements which have been adopted by the several Union Societies which so far have been organized.

It is evident from the reasons assigned, and from others which will suggest themselves, that the unification of Protestant Christianity cannot be brought about by uniformity in all phases of Dogmatic belief.

May it not be that in the wane of the Confessions Providence is pointing the way to the true solution of the problem before us? That is through the Creed-Principle.

Not by Church polity, worship, or doctrine; but by an agreement in essentials, the Creed-contents, the eternal verities of Divine revelation, which constitute the substance of the faith of all ages. The doctrine of the Person of the Redeemer, as the supreme self-revelation of God in redemption, and the true source and centre of Christian faith, is coming more and more

* An address delivered before the Cleveland Church Congress, June 1886, by Daniel Curry, D.D., LL.D.

† Since the preparation of this paper, the question of Revision has come before the American Presbyterian Church, and is now causing intense agitation. I am gratified to find that the positions taken in my discussion of the general subject are strongly corroborated by all the prominent advocates of Revision.—J. C. B.

to secure for itself the place which at various times has been usurped by the dogma of the Divine Decrees, the dogma of Inspiration, or the dogma of the Church.

This Christological principle, which is the very core of the Apostles' Creed, has taken hold upon the mind of the Church as never before, and the most thoughtful minds of the age see in it the only true bond of fellowship which can bind together the different branches of Christendom.

Judged by this standard, the test of orthodoxy shall be: not, What are your doctrinal opinions? but What are your articles of faith? What think ye of Christ?

By the side of the Christological principle the spirit of confessional narrowness cannot thrive, but will give way to an enlarged, tolerant, charitable spirit, which will allow wide room for diverse theological opinions.

Such freedom of theological thought is not incompatible with strong and pure faith, or with the idea of Christian fellowship. Nor does it tend to skeptical latitudinarianism.

True Christian liberality consists in having a positive belief which accepts whatever measure of truth there is in every Confession, and which is open to more truth than is specifically defined in any or all of them. It is susceptible at all times to the suggestions of truth from whatever source they may come.

Many of the denominations are nearing this high plane of Christian liberality. And already the beneficial effects of assuming such a position of religious freedom abundantly appear in the better understanding and higher appreciation of the real nature of Christianity, and in the profounder faith in, and comprehension of its most sacred truths.*

In the new era, which seems to be fast approaching, there will prevail a spirit of Catholicity which will allow the principle of confessionalism all the freedom that is consistent with the legitimate demands of progressive Christian science. The former tendencies to controversial bitterness and strife will be obviated

* *The Doctrine of Sacred Scripture*, Ladd, Vol. I., Int.

by the restraining and unifying power of the common faith-bond, or Creed-principle.

Doctrinal differences will neither interfere with free fellowship, nor stand in the way of zealous, united work for the advancement of the kingdom of Christ.

Rev. Principal Edwards, D.D., of Wales, in his admirable address on "The Intellectual tendencies of the Age," delivered before the Alliance of Reformed Churches in London last summer, expressed the hope that the Church of the future would "draw from the fountain of truth in the Word of God a theology which shall be more Divine than Arminianism, more human than Calvinism, and more Christian than either, that it may combine them both in the broader and deeper truth concerning the Person of Christ." This is but one of the many prophetic voices of the age which tell of the wane of orthodox confessionalism, and herald the incoming of a new period, when, under the reign of a more Catholic form of Protestant Christianity, Confessions will be subservient to the Creed of the Church, and doctrine will sustain its true relation to faith.

V.

CHURCH AUTHORITY, CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

BY REV. A. B. KOPLIN, D.D.

The Idea of the Church.

"THE Church is the Body of Christ." As such she is the legitimate and necessary birth of the Holy Ghost as the spirit of Christ glorified. She is the "Bride, the Lamb's wife," who is the mother of all the redeemed. As such she is a living constitution present in the world, whose prerogative it is to carry forward the work of human redemption to all the nations of the earth, on to the end of time.

The Church is to accomplish this great work, not in her own name and by her own power, but in the name and by the power of Him who has commissioned her and has given her to represent His authority, for the glory of God in the salvation of men.

Authority, no less than any other quality of the Church, is an attribute of her being, and helps to distinguish her as the "Body of Christ." Like her holiness, so her authority and power belong to her very life, and can never be separated from her without destroying her identity as the formal presence of the Kingdom of God among men. As the human will is that power which determines all man's conscious actions through which he develops a distinctive personality, so the authority of the Church is that quality by which she is determined to carry forward the work of human redemption, in accordance with the divine purpose and plan, until the Church militant shall be transformed into the Church triumphant.

As the law of germination, assimilation and appropriation lies in the acorn, so lies the law of the exercise of the "keys" in the Church of Christ; and as this law of life must be active in the tree in gathering within its own constitution the elements of its growth, and repelling and expelling all noxious matter in order to the promotion and enhancement of its life, so must the Church exercise her authority and power in receiving within her embrace all true believers, and expelling from her bosom all who prove unfaithful to their holy vows.

And so again, as this law of life pervades the entire tree, in like manner does the authority of the Church pervade her entire body; but, as not all the parts of the tree are the same part, and as the functions of these different parts are not the same functions, so it is "given to the Church by the same Spirit, to have some apostles; and some prophets; and some evangelists; and some teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of the ministry, unto the building up of the Body of Christ; till we all attain unto the unity of the faith and the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full-grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ."

CHURCH AUTHORITY

Is binding and loosing in its nature, both in its legislative and executive character. All this is most forcibly expressed by our Saviour when He says to St. Peter: "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." And again, where He speaks to all the apostles, saying: "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Let it, however, be remembered that these words exclude all idea of arbitrary rule in Christ's name. No thought is more foreign from these words of solemn authority than that the Church is to "Lord it over God's heritage." Yea more. This authority to administer the "power of the keys" is grounded

in the principle of that gospel which is the life of Christ, as this holds in the person of the confessor, and gives expression of itself in the confession of St. Peter, when he says: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God."

To the extent, therefore, in which the Church is animated with the life of Christ and governed by his spirit, is it possible for her to possess this authority and exercise this power in Christ's name. So far, but no further. The Church must ever realize in her heart of hearts, that only when she is able to exclaim with the first synod of Jerusalem: "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us," may her utterances be regarded as the voice of God. Then, and then only, may she claim for her voice a "Thus saith the Lord." And we must ever be careful to distinguish between the binding and the loosing power, on one hand, and the authority to administer on the other hand.

The former is the gospel as the Living Word of the ever present Lord; and the latter only the right of its administration. The word of God only is that power which can wake into life eternal those who believe on His name, and condemn those who reject His proffered grace. The prerogative to give life unto men belongs only unto Christ, as He who is the conqueror of death and the Giver of life. We who minister in holy things are only the earthen vessels through which these precious gifts are conveyed unto a dying world.

Therefore, the Church, animated by the life of Christ, and alive to her awfully solemn and responsible commission, can, at best, but truly preach the gospel, administer the sacraments, and exercise Christian discipline. It is not our preaching which gives saving power to the gospel, much rather "men are reconciled to God through the foolishness of preaching," because the gospel preached is "the power of God unto salvation, unto every one that believeth."

The same principle holds good also with reference to the sacraments. For it is not our doctrinal conception nor our administration of these holy mysteries which gives them their

power to ingraft men into the Body Mystical, and then to feed and nourish those who believe unto eternal life. On the contrary, they possess within themselves all their intrinsic significance and force by virtue of their appointment by the Great Head of the Church; and therefore, by the abiding presence of the Spirit of God in them for that end. We are only the stewards of the mysteries of God, who are to administer them to those that believe, for their salvation; and we are warned to be watchful, that we may be accounted faithful in our ministry.

And so also with Christian discipline. "The keys of the kingdom" do not receive their power to bind and to loose from the Church which exercises them, but from the Lord who has ordained them; and it must never be forgotten that their proper and ultimate end is to unlock the truth of God and to bar the gates of hell.

It matters not, therefore, how many councils, or Papal bulls, or deliverances of Synods may declare that for truth which is not truth; it will ever remain error still. And so that which is truth may be denounced as error ten thousand times; yet it will remain truth forever. There is no power, however great, which can change the truth of God into a lie or transmute error into the word of God. Truth is eternal, and therefore only in so far as the Church declares the truth as it is in Christ, can it be said that she opens to believers and closes to unbelievers the kingdom of God.

And hence most clearly, if the Church were to exclude from her communion such as are, in the eyes of God, entitled to the fellowship of the saints, her loosing upon earth could not be sealed in heaven. And so, on the other hand, only in so far as she rightfully admits to her sealing ordinances such as are, in the eyes of the Searcher of hearts, entitled to these exalted privileges, can it be said of a truth that her binding upon earth is bound in heaven.

From all this we cannot help but see the awful responsibility which rests upon the Church both in her collective deliver-

ances and in the individual capacity of her ministers, in the exercise of the functions of the sacred office. Only in so far as Christ is in us can His ministrations be rightfully accomplished by us. Without Him we can be but "as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal." With Him we are His "ambassadors," beseeching men in Christ's stead, "Be ye reconciled to God."

What Form does this Authority assume in the Government of the Church?

The Roman Church claims that the true form of church government is hierarchal, and that all ecclesiastical power culminates ultimately in one man as Christ's vicar on earth. This claim is made to rest upon the passage quoted in the first part of this article, where it would seem that Christ had committed the binding and loosing power of the Church into the hands of St. Peter. But if these words of our Saviour made St. Peter Pope, then what are we to understand of the words of precisely the same solemn import, addressed to the college of apostles? If,—“I give unto *thee* the keys of the kingdom of heaven,” when spoken to St. Peter, made him Pope, then are we not forced to admit that when Christ said to the apostles in their collective capacity, “I give unto *you* the keys of the kingdom of heaven,” He made all the apostles popes? Surely there can be no other alternative. Thus the Church would have had no less than a full dozen of popes to begin with. Each would be his own Pope, and all might, with equal right, claim the pontifical chair. But who is so blind as not to be able to see that all this would amount only to the very essence of confusion and anarchy. Whatever may be claimed for St. Peter, we cannot but believe that the New Testament Scriptures, fairly interpreted, assign him the place of *chief among equals*, and nothing more. And so, again, no matter what may be claimed for the Papacy, one thing must forever remain clear; and that is that, rightly interpreted, there is nothing to be found in the New Testament Scriptures which warrant the Roman theory of ecclesiastical authority.

Whatever, therefore, may be the claims of the Roman Church, and whatever may be the concessions to those claims by Christian apologetics, yet, so long as we have the word of God as our guide, and the light of history as our vantage ground, we are slow to believe that it ever was the design of the Great Head of the Church that her government should assume the papal form. Nor do we believe that the Papacy was best adapted to the development of the Church and the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom in any part of her history, the middle ages not excepted.

We think it can be easily shown that it was not because of the Roman Hierarchy that the Church converted the nations of Europe to the Christian religion. Much rather did she thus triumph in spite of the Papacy, because she, as the Body of Christ, is so replete with His blessed life, and so completely under His protecting care, "that the gates of hell shall never prevail against her," and, therefore, *can* and *will* thrive under flagrant misrule, no less than under dire persecution.

The Episcopacy

must find its warrant for existence, not in the teachings of Christ, nor yet in the practice of the apostles, but rather in a gradual development which had its beginning in the second century, modified in various ways by the influence of the civil government of the Middle Ages, and culminating finally in its present form in the latter part of the Reformation, after even some of its archbishops entered upon the duties of their office on no higher authority than an appointment by the Civil Protector; while others received their ordination, at least in part, at the hands of Presbyters.

It is a well-attested fact of history that there existed in the primitive Church but three orders of the sacred office, namely, bishops, presbyters and deacons; that these existed, or might exist at the same time, in each congregation of the Church; that the names of Bishop, Presbyter and Deacon were synonymous with those of Pastor, Elders and Deacons, and that the

office of bishop or pastor was everywhere the same; so that each bishop stood on a level with all the rest in all the functions and powers of the sacred office. All this is forcibly set forth by Bingham in his "Antiquities of the Christian Church," where he says, after St. Cyprian: "There is but one bishopric in the Church, and every Bishop has an *undivided portion in it*. It is no *monarchy*, but a *diffusive* power, which lies in the *whole college* of Bishops."

So also Canon Farrar, in his "Early Days of Christianity," where he enters into a lengthy and able argument to prove that St. John, the Apostle, is the author of the Apocalypse, says among other things: "In its ordinary sense the term Elder was applicable to any person who was a member of a Presbytery. But it had a special sense, in which it meant one who belonged to the earliest generations of Christians. In this sense it is constantly used by Ireneus though *by his time the distinction* between Bishop and Presbyter, which is not found in the New Testament, had been gradually introduced."

Dean Stanley in his "Christian Institutes" says: "In the days of the apostles . . . the Bishop was synonymous with Presbyter or Elder." And again: "The Bishop in the second century, when first he became elevated above his fellow Presbyters, appears for a time to have *concentrated* in himself all the functions which they had hitherto exercised." But this exclusive monopoly has never been fully conceded. "Everywhere Presbyters have successfully reasserted the power of consecrating, baptizing, marrying, and absolving . . . Everywhere except in the English Church, they claim the right of confirming. Everywhere, they have, with the Bishops, retained a share in the right of ordaining Presbyters. At Alexandria they long retained the right of ordaining Bishops."

All this to say the least, is in very poor keeping with that arrogance which claims for modern Episcopacy, the all in all of Ecclesiastical organization; and which would, by a single stroke, unchurch all which does not appear in its own straight jacket, so long in making.

Congregationalism.

As the primitive idea of Ecclesiastical authority is not found in the Hierarchy, or the Episcopacy, so do we in like manner look for it in vain, in Congregational Independency. According to the former scheme, carried out to its legitimate end, all authority culminates in one man, as in the Roman Church. And according to the other, all is made to culminate in the people; so that in the one case there is an absolute monarchy, and in the other, a complete anarchy.

Congregationalism bases its theory of Church government on the common priesthood of all believers; and in its zeal for the representation of the membership, in the government of the Church, it loses sight entirely of the Divine idea of the Church as the community of believers in unity; as it is so forcibly set forth by the Apostle Paul, where he says: "Now are ye the Body of Christ; and severally members thereof. And God hath set some in the Church, first, apostles; secondly, prophets; thirdly, teachers." . . . And then adds: "Are all apostles? are all teachers? are all prophets?" thus teaching the Corinthians, and so also the whole Church, that there exists in the Church, by Divine appointment, an order of men whose mission it is to preach the gospel, to defend the faith, to administer the sacraments and to exercise the power of the keys. All this, however, not in a separate and independent way, but rather in strict accord with the unity of the faith as this holds in the Body Mystical. To preserve this unity there exists in the Church a corporate authority, which in the light of the Scriptures and in the practice of the apostles, is found alone in the Collective Tribunal of ministers and elders, for it must not be forgotten that the Apostles, whilst they were the *founders* of the Church, they were also at the same time ministers of the Word and Sacraments.

Synodical Church Authority and Government.

The voice of the first Synod of the Apostles and Elders at Jerusalem, as recorded in Acts 15: 28: "It seemed good to

the Holy Ghost and to us, to lay upon you no greater burdens than these necessary things," is the key-note to that absolute commentary on the words of our Saviour to St. Peter: "I will give unto thee the keys of the Kingdom," etc., and to the college of Apostles: I will give unto you the keys of the Kingdom, etc., which must furnish the Church with their only true interpretation for all time. That the Apostles did not misunderstand the Saviour in this solemn commission must be evident to all; for Christ knew too well that all depended upon their right understanding of the solemn authority, which He committed into their hands, to leave them in any doubt of its awful import; and, therefore, He breathed on them, and opened their spiritual understanding, and inspired them with the Holy Ghost, who would lead them into all the truth. And surely no one would claim that the Holy Ghost could contradict Himself by giving to the Apostles' successors, a second inspiration which would be destructive of the first. On the contrary, what He has settled once must stand forever.

And now: What did the Apostles understand the words of our Saviour, delegating to them their *binding* and *loosing* power, to mean? Their acts alone can answer this question, and hence we appeal to them.

An important doctrinal question which affected vital principles of the Christian religion arose in the Church at Antioch. The peace of the congregation and the safety of Christianity demanded that this question should be authoritatively settled. This could only be done by the *binding* and *loosing* power vested somewhere in the Church. If this power belonged to the people the only proper course to have pursued in the premises, would have been to call together the congregation and secure their voice by a vote of all the members present. The sequel, however, shows that this was not the course pursued. Hence it must necessarily follow, that Congregational Independency is not that form of ecclesiastical authority which the teachings of Christ and the practice of His apostles warrant. If on the other hand, this power was delegated to all the apostles sever-

ally, thus constituting each one Pope, then St. Paul also was a Pope. And as he was present at Antioch during the controversy in question, the Church must go to him for a decision. But who does not know that the Church did not go to St. Paul; and that he did not decide their controversy for them. Hence it clearly follows that St. Paul was not a Pope, and also, that not each of the Apostles was a Pope.

And once more. If Christ ordained St. Peter and his successors to be His vicar, and the Church's Pope, and hence the infallible exponent of all matters of faith and practice for all Christendom, then the only course for the Church of Antioch to have pursued would have been to go to St. Peter and ask for his decision of their important question. But all who have ever read the Acts of the Apostles with any care, are well aware that they did not go to St. Peter, and that he did not pronounce a bull upon the question in dispute. Hence the only conclusion to be arrived at is, that St. Peter was not the vicar of Christ nor the Pope of the Church; and therefore, all the claims of entire popedom, together with all its splendid pomp must fall to the ground.

If then, Ecclesiastical authority is not, by Divine right, and the practice of the Apostles, vested in the people as claimed by Congregational Independency, on the one hand; nor in the Episcopacy or the Papacy on the other hand, where must we then seek for it? The settlement of the trouble of the Church at Antioch has long ago answered this question. What was that answer? The inspired chronicler tells us in these words: "The brethren appointed that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them should go up to Jerusalem unto the Apostles and Elders about this question." It was not Paul and Barnabas who determined upon this course, nor was it the members of the Church, independent of the Apostle and his co-laborer. But it was rather the united action of the Church, made up of ministers and people in their collective capacity as a community of believers—The "*Ecclesia*." Paul and Barnabas departed on their imparted mission; and "When they came to Jerusalem,

they were received of the Church and the Apostles and Elders." The Apostles and Elders came together and Paul and Barnabas "rehearsed all things that God had done with them." The Apostles and Elders in Synodical assembly met, examined the matter laid before them; discussed and considered it in all its bearings, and then decided upon it; and conveyed their deliverance to the Church at Antioch by the hands of Barnabas and Paul; and confirmed their deliverance by sending with them Judas and Silas, who told the Church the same things by word of mouth. "This action of the Synod gave the Antiochian Church great consolation, and settled the important doctrinal question involved for all time. And well it might, for it was God's own way; and for this reason the Synod of Jerusalem could well say: "So it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us;" for they were fully conscious that their deliverance was the voice of God speaking to the Church through them.

Notwithstanding, therefore, that there is no absolute word and act of our Lord whereby He ordained any particular scheme of Church authority and government, yet, when we remember that He chose and ordained the apostles to be the founders of His Church, and for that purpose permeated them with His own blessed life, and inspired them with His Holy Spirit, that He might abide with them forever and lead them into all truth; and seeing that that form of ecclesiastical authority and government which they inaugurated and practiced is Synodical, it seems to us that it must be clear to any unprejudiced mind, that this must be the form indicated by the Great Head of the Church. And we may, therefore, be well assured that that form of church government which prevails among us is of God.

The higher and the lower Courts in Synodical Church Government and their Relation to each other.

In the Reformed Church these are the Consistory and spiritual Council, the Classis, the Synod and the General Synod; and their powers are wholly spiritual. They possess the right of requiring obedience to the laws of Christ; and of punishing the disobedient by excluding them from the privileges of the Church.

The General Synod represents the whole Church, and is its highest judicatory. As such it authorizes all changes in the ordinances of the Church; and is the last resort in all cases respecting her government, not finally adjudicated by the Synod. The General Synod is composed of an equal number of ministers and elders delegated by all the Classes severally, and a quorum must consist of at least twenty-four delegates, from a majority of all the Classes, . . . and of whom at least one-third must be elders.

* The Synod, again, is composed of the ministers and elders of the several Classes embraced in a prescribed district; and has such powers, for the government of the Church, as the General Synod has not reserved to itself.

The Classis consists of all the Ministers and delegated Elders of the congregations within a certain district designated by the Synod, and takes cognizance of whatever the welfare of the congregations committed to their care, may from time to time require.

The Consistory is composed of the Pastor, Elders and Deacons of the congregation. To them belongs the management of all the interests of the congregation, subject to the constitution of the Church.

The General Synod is over the Synod; the Synod over the Classis; the Classis over the Consistory and the Consistory over the congregation.

Thus in Synodical Church Government the whole Ecclesia is represented. The congregation is represented in the Consistory; the Consistory in the Classis; the Classis in the Synod; and the Synod in the General Synod.

In all these bodies the Delegated Elders have equal rights and responsibilities with the Ministers of the Word and Sacraments. Under this form of government all danger of ignoring freedom, as in the Roman Church, and the equal danger of disowning authority as in Congregational Independency is avoided; while the common priesthood of all believers is made to complement the sacred office in all its degrees, from the lowest to the highest.

VI.

EMERSON.

BY CHARLES H. LERCH.

Two names are often spoken of by men connectedly as striking features in the intellectual and spiritual advancement of the Present Age. Thomas Carlyle and Ralph Waldo Emerson will always be remembered as teachers of "high thinking and plain living." Principal Shairp, in a lecture at Oxford, has described the appearance of some of the writings of Carlyle at that Institution, and the interest they awakened there. "The young Glasgow Professor of Greek," says he, "newly come from the first place in the Cambridge Classical Tripos, and fresh from the society of the Cambridge Apostles, told how he had lately heard Carlyle lecture upon Heroes, more like a man inspired than any one he had ever listened to. Then early in the 1840's, when the miscellanies appeared, and became known to undergraduates here in Oxford, I remember how they reached the more active-minded, one by one, and thrilled them as no printed book had ever before thrilled them."

But Carlyle was not the only man who inspired the minds of young Oxford undergraduates. Mr. Mathew Arnold eloquently describes the impression which the teachings of Mr. Emerson, from this side of the Atlantic, made upon that Institution.

"Forty years ago," says Mr. Arnold, "when I was an undergraduate at Oxford, voices were in the air there which haunt my memory still. Happy the man, who, in that susceptible season of youth, hears such voices! They are a possession to him forever." "There came to us in that old Oxford Time a voice also from this side of the Atlantic—a clear and pure voice—

which, for my ear, at any rate, brought a strain as new and moving and unforgettable as the strain of Newman or Carlyle or Goethe."

And not only was old Oxford fortunate enough to hear strains so new, so moving and so unforgettable, but in England and America, everywhere, the teachings of Carlyle and Emerson became a divining-rod to the higher natures in men. The American College received from the message which Mr. Emerson brought to her an impulse—"an inspiring lift," as James Russell Lowell tells us, "which only genius can give, and without which all doctrine is chaff."

Whatever may be said of the teachings of Mr. Emerson, it was not the Truth or the Half-truth of which he was the exponent, that enthused his hearers. Plato, Homer, St. Paul, Shakespeare, Bacon, Montaigne, Luther, Wordsworth, Goethe, from whose pages he had helped himself to ideas, were read and known in his day. He was not the expounder of a new Philosophy nor the teacher of new Truths.

Nor was it the admirably gifted Emerson, the Poet, Seer, Philosopher, who stood before his audience, giving them an exhibition of his powers. But it was the material which he gathered everywhere wrought into him which had turned itself into spiritual flesh and blood—his personality in short—that made him the charm and power that he was. Thus it always is; not the Truth alone, nor the man, but the combination of the truth and the man always compels men to listen. The moral law written upon tables of stone was the guiding star of multitudes of men, but the moral law incarnate "spake as never man spake." Jesus said, "I am the Way, the Truth and the Life." Mr. Lowell, who has always enjoyed the opportunities of seeing great men, says of Mr. Emerson that "there was a majesty about him beyond all other men I have known, and he habitually dwelt in that ampler and diviner air to which most of us, if ever, only rise in spurts."

Emerson knew, no doubt, the full measure of his powers. But he also had an adequate conception of his weakness. To

him we must look for the best criticism of his ability or inability. On the one hand he says: "I do not belong to the poets, but only to a low department of literature, the reporters, suburban men." On the other hand he says: "I am born a poet, of a low class without a doubt, yet a poet. This is my nature and vocation." He says again: "Here I sit and read and write with very little system." He seems to have his eyes fixed more upon the truth than upon himself. This is true humility. Conscious of his limitations, he does not seem to be disturbed over it. Conscious of his powers, he does not seem to be unduly exalted. He is interested in what is before him—the truth. The result is, and must always be, humility. I take this passage from the *Modern Painters* of Mr. John Ruskin, every sentence of which seems to be applicable to Mr. Emerson: "I believe the first test of a truly great man is his humility. I do not mean by humility, doubt of his own power, or hesitation in speaking his opinions; but a right understanding of the relation between what he can do and say, and the rest of the world's sayings and doings." All great men "have a curious undersense of powerlessness, feeling that the greatness is not in them, but through them." The "inspiring lift" which men did receive, and do still receive, comes from the combination of the Truth and the man in the Personality of Mr. Emerson.

There is another quality which shines out from the writings of Mr. Emerson, and which always attracts the minds of men wherever and whenever it is asserted. It is Tolerance. Emerson never tried to compel his hearers to think as he did. He uttered the word, the opinion, and gave men the liberty of choice. Can anything be more expressive of Tolerance than this remark of his when he had scruples about administering the Lord's Supper to his congregation? He resigned his charge and said: "I have no hostility to this institution; I am only stating my want of sympathy with it. Neither should I ever have obtruded this opinion upon other people, had I not been called by my office to administer it." "I am content that it stand

to the end of the world if it please men and please heaven, and I shall rejoice in all the good it produces."

Emerson's Tolerance attracted men of all creeds and beliefs towards him, and, as Hawthorne tells us in the "Old Manse," that "his mind acted upon other minds, of a certain constitution, with wonderful magnetism, and drew many men upon long pilgrimages, to speak with him face to face."

Strongly contrasted with his Tolerance is Emerson's Independence. Tolerant as he was towards the opinions of others, he was in a high degree independent in asserting his own. This was not Egotism. He believed it to be his duty to speak out his observations and convictions and not to defend them. With Polemics he would simply have nothing to do. After delivering an address before the Senior Class in Divinity College, the Rev. Henry Ware wrote to him that some of his statements might tend to overthrow the influence of Christianity. To him Emerson replied, "As my conviction is perfect in the substantial truth of the doctrines of this discourse, and is not very new, you will see at once that it must appear very important that it be spoken;" "let us say our uttermost word, and let the all-pervading truth, as it surely will, judge between us." There are those who say that Emerson was inconsistent. This Inconsistency is nothing more than his extreme Independence in speaking out his convictions at any one time. Utterly indifferent to the teachings of those in his time or in any time he speaks out to-day what may be the directly opposite of what he asserted yesterday. "With consistency," he says, "a great soul has simply nothing to do." "Speak what you think now in hard words and to-morrow speak what to-morrow thinks in hard words again, though it contradict everything you said to-day—'ah, so you shall be sure to be misunderstood.' Is it so bad to be misunderstood? Pythagoras was misunderstood, and Socrates, and Jesus, and Luther, and Copernicus, and Galileo, and Newton, and every pure and wise spirit that ever took flesh. To be great is to be misunderstood."

Independence, self-reliance, these are themes upon which he loves to dwell. He has devoted a whole Essay to the consideration of Self-reliance. To the young, with whom it is said that his influence was great, he could have uttered no more inspiring, not to say, important word. His words, on such a subject as this, may have been the fire added to the already accumulated kindling, in the soul of many a young man.

What is his doctrine of Self-reliance if he has any? "Trust thyself," he says; "every heart vibrates to that iron string. Accept the place the divine Providence has found for you, the society of your contemporaries, the connection of events. Great men have always done so, and confided themselves childlike to the genius of their age, betraying their perception that the absolutely trustworthy was seated at their heart, working through their hands, predominating in all their being. And we are now men, and must accept in the highest mind the same transcendent destiny; and not minors and invalids in a protected corner, not cowards fleeing before a revolution, but guides, redeemers and benefactors, obeying the Almighty effort and advancing on Chaos and the Dark."

And to explain what Emerson means by Self-trust, I will quote what Mr. Cooke, his interpreter, says: "We surrender ourselves absolutely to the will of God, obey His laws, hearken only to His voice and then we become strong with His strength and wise with His truth. That this is what he means by Self-trust Emerson has himself distinctly stated."

Another phase of Emerson's teachings is his Optimism. A great deal has been said about this. He has often been contrasted with Carlyle, who, in his teachings, is rather a pessimist than an optimist. Every great Teacher is a medium through whom things are presented to us. God, Man, Nature, the World, comes to us through the Medium Emerson and we have optimism. God, Man, Nature, the World come to us through the medium Carlyle, and we have pessimism. These are then the two things the World and the medium. There are those who when there is a question about their views and teachings

look into the World, the things about them for a reply. As if the "struggle for existence," opposition, the hard and stern dealings of the world, were to be held accountable for what they are and say. And yet it is easy to see, that struggle, opposition, the dealings of the world make one man hopeful, serene, calm, another morose, sullen, bitter. The moral atmosphere of a home, whether wholesome or unwholesome, makes one son faithful, obedient; another base and undutiful. The same business makes one man upright, another dishonest.

When the same objects pass through different media and reflect to us different images we must look for an explanation of the difference not to the objects, but to the media.

Emerson, then, is our medium, and when we seek for an explanation of his optimism, we must look for it in him. Emerson's Temperament, hopeful, serene, calm, that is the medium. What is temperament the result of? Is a good or a bad temperament an endowment? It may be so; and yet in its most comprehensive sense, it is the natural man transformed more or less by the Philosophy to which he adheres. Carlyle's perverseness is often explained by his Physical debility, his early training. But far more was his whole being influenced by the Philosophy which he believed in. In the midst of his trials, misfortunes, failures, Emerson is always happy, serene, calm. He tells us that "we judge of a man's wisdom by his hope." This Hope, says Mathew Arnold, "was the ground of his being; it never failed him."

It is said that Emerson was possessed all his life-long with a feeling of his bodily infirmity, and yet only here and there occasionally in verse do we hear him refer to it. Death visited his family and we hear him say such lines,

"House and tenant go to ground,
Lost in God, in Godhead found."

And then again when he thinks of his imperfections, his inability to do what he thinks ought to be done, he says, "I am very easy in my mind and never dream of suicide. My whole Philosophy, which is very real, teaches acquiescence and optimism."

It might be inferred, perhaps, that Emerson's Optimism was so comprehensive in its sweep that it did not take notice of sin in the world. But the reader of Emerson will notice that he not only detects what is mean, and petty, and sinful, but that he is also not slow to condemn it. Only through all his fault-finding and censuring there runs a vein of optimism.

Listen to him when he speaks of Success: "I hate this shallow Americanism which hopes to get rich by credit, to get knowledge by raps on midnight tables, to learn the economy of the mind by phrenology, or skill without study, or mastery without apprenticeship, or the sale of goods through pretending that they sell, or power through making believe you are powerful, or through a packed jury or caucus, bribery and 'repeating' votes, or wealth by fraud. They think they have got it, but they have got something else—a crime which calls for another crime, and another devil behind that; these are steps to suicide, infamy and the harming of mankind."

This is censure, indeed; but it is different from that hopeless view of things which Carlyle often favors us with. Here is one of Carlyle's pictures: "Perhaps London is the proper place for me after all, seeing all places are improper: who knows? Meanwhile I lead a most dyspeptic, solitary, self-shrouded life; consuming, if possible in silence, my considerable daily allotment of pain: glad when any strength is left in me for writing, which is the only use I can see in myself,—too rare a case of late. The ground of my existence is black as death; too black, when all void, too; but at times there paint themselves on it pictures of gold, and rainbow, and lightning; all the brighter for the black ground, I suppose. Withal, I am very much of a fool."

Tolerance, independence, self-reliance, optimism—these are things we shall find in Emerson. And those who will look and search deeply into him will find lessons not a few on such important subjects.

There are two classes of writers and thinkers, who are designated by the terms safe and unsafe: safe, because they are the

teachers of sound views, sound philosophy, sound faith; unsafe, because they are the teachers of unorthodox views, unsound philosophy, partial or erroneous faith. Emerson is often called unsafe. There are those who are prejudiced and will not read him, because of the verdict, unsafe, brought against him by those who may or may not be able to judge. And yet, in spite of what the most reliable authority can say, is not the safety or unsafety of a writer a personal matter and must be determined by us individually? Valuable as the suggestions and ideas of the critic may be, we must still, back of it all, solve the equation and determine the value of the unknown quantity for ourselves. To judge a man and to become prejudiced against him through hearsay is as narrow as it is contemptible. Examination always precedes judgment.

Emerson will never benefit or injure you or me through the intervention of a third party. Criticism is only valuable as it brings you nearer the original. Whether Emerson be safe or unsafe is a problem that must be solved by the reader himself, and not by the critic.

There are those who, when there is any suspicion as to the unsoundness of any book, avoid it, and thus try to preserve their faith by hedging it about with a wall. And yet we know that the strength of anything consists in its capacity to withstand opposition.

Healthy doctors and nurses do not fear disease. A strong and live faith does not fear the attacks of unbelief. Opposition is the very law of its growth. The spiritual writer understood the philosophy of growth by opposition when he said: "Count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations."

Dr. Phillips Brooks says: "The old policy which makes indexes of forbidden books can never do anything for faith. Whatever a man can read in honesty, and humility, and consecration, and the pure desire of truth, let him read it; and if there be any deadly thing in what he reads, it shall not harm him. I say this solemnly, deliberately, thoughtfully, knowing that many young people are hearing and I hope are noting

what I say. I say it without hesitation; only I beg you to remember how profound are the conditions which alone give one the right to read the skeptics and yet hope to keep his faith." "There are dabblers in unbelief on every side of us, who are being poisoned through and through by the skepticism which they drink in. There are other men who know vastly more than they about what unbelief has said, who are more full of real faith for all their study."

There are those again who say that Mr. Emerson is disconnected, and who claim that it is mere mental dissipation to read him. Let Mr. Lowell answer such objectors: "Did they say he was disconnected? So were the stars, that seemed larger to our eyes, still keen with that excitement as we walked homeward with prouder stride over the creaking snow."

"Were we enthusiasts?" continues he; "I hope and believe we were, and am thankful to the man who made us worth something for once in our lives." "Enough that he had set that ferment of wholesome discontent at work in us."

Yes! "that ferment of wholesome discontent at work in us."

Surely, if Emerson could do but this one thing for us, it seems to me that he would be worthy of our gravest consideration.

The Church of the nineteenth century needs this stimulant.

Men and women seated in their church-pews are saying to themselves, this problem or that problem of our Holy religion is too difficult for us. Let the Priest or the Bishop, or the Preacher solve it. We shall be content with their conclusions. Or, as a great thinker puts it: "A row of comfortable, self-contented, conservative gentlemen and ladies standing up, for instance, and singing, 'Onward Christian Soldiers marching as to war,' or 'Hold the fort for I am coming, Jesus signals still,' reminds us all the more of how unmilitary and unheroic are the lives they live."

This is Emerson's mission, to make us discontent with ourselves, to show us the many sides of things. He does not favor us with any final definitions of things, or any system of

Philosophy, or perhaps any set creed. He rather culls out from different Philosophies and creeds, and shows how many different views of a subject are possible. There are men probably who might lament the fact that Emerson is not one of the staid Philosophy-makers who would give us a well digested system, thoroughly reliable. And yet it is a question whether we would have him any different from what he is, if we could? That we need men of his stamp can not be doubted. They are the men who, in the midst of the dead formalism of their times, sweep away all boundaries, and bring us back to the very source and fountain from whence sprang such formulæ. That Emerson and Carlyle performed such a work is generally granted. Carlyle, with his impetuosity and vehemence, did not teach men new truths, but simply removed the veil which hid old and reliable truths from men's sight, and held up to his time the "Divine Idea of the Universe."

Emerson's mission was much the same. He taught men the idea that true idealism was holding up all things in the world, and looking at them in the light of God.

An idea which cannot be too much emphasized in a day, when Science continually fasten's men's minds on secondary causes.

It is possible for the knowledge and the wisdom of an age to ripen itself into a conceit, and men think that in them is all the light, and that if their ideas were set at work in the world, its salvation would be speedily accomplished. Then comes some great Thinker, thoroughly conscious of his mission, thoroughly charged with indignation at such conceit, and exposes the whole fallacy.

This, it seems to me, Emerson did in his time, and shocked men and rebuked men, and showed them that besides twelve Apostles which the Lord had appointed to carry on the Evangelization of the world, there were also other seventy appointed. The importance of such work as Emerson did will be readily seen, I think, from the acknowledgments which men make to him for what he did for them. Prof. Tyndall says:

"The first time I ever knew Waldo Emerson was when, years ago, I picked up on a stall a copy of his *Nature*. I read it with delight; and I have never ceased to read it; and if any one can be said to have given the impulse to my mind, it is Emerson. Whatever I have done the world owes to him." If men had not regarded Emerson's work important, they would have paid very little or no attention to him. He has received the attention of Biographers, Critics—not a few—so that Dr. Holmes found the ground upon which he entered already occupied by three considerable memoirs.

Emerson's thinking is intensely suggestive. "You cannot prize him too much," says Mathew Arnold, "nor heed him too diligently. He has lessons for both the branches of our race. I figure him to my mind as visible upon earth still, as still standing here by Boston Bay, or at his own Concord, in his habit as he lived, but of heightened stature and shining feature, with one hand stretched out towards the East, to our laden and laboring England; the other towards the ever growing West, to his own dearly loved America. To us he shows for guidance his lucid freedom, his cheerfulness and hope; to you his dignity, delicacy, serenity, elevation."

VII.

THE LAY ELEMENT IN MISSIONS.*

BY S. M. ZWEMER.

SAYS Dr. S. Macpherson, "It is a fundamental principle of Christianity that every man ought to be a Christian, every Christian a missionary and every church a mission-station." Were this principle a fact instead of an ideal there would be no need of a paper on the subject before us. All men are not Christians; all Christians are not missionaries, nor are all churches mission-stations. More than one-half of humanity are still without the knowledge of Christ, and even in our country only a small per cent. of the population are church attendants. Of those who *are*, scarcely one-third are actively engaged in any form of mission work. So far from each church being a mission station there are at present in the United States 5000 Evangelical Churches which do not give a dollar annually to the cause of Foreign Missions. Such is a common-place statement of the missionary problem. The question arises have we a sufficient force of ordained pastors and missionaries to meet this need in the world field or to awaken the zeal of the entire Church? Are the 82,700 pastors in our country and the total of 6000 ordained missionaries in the foreign field, with the annual additions from our seminaries, adequate for the present crisis of missions? To put the question is to answer it. The increase of population (natural plus that of immigration) in our country is about one million and a half annually; while the total increase of men into the ministry from our Theological Semina-

* A paper read before the Lancaster Meeting of the Missionary Alliance, March 18, 1889, and now published by special request.

ries (Roman Catholic and Protestant) is only 2000 annually. In view of these facts—not even counting the decrease in the ministry occasioned by death and by sending laborers into the foreign field—what is to become of the vacant pastorates and home mission fields of the future?

The question of the lay element in missions is therefore forced upon the Church for consideration. A certain part of Christ's work on earth must to-day be done by others than ordained ministers or remain undone. The Lord's war has waxed hot. God Almighty has called for volunteer troops for eighteen centuries and a glorious army have fought and are fighting under the banner of the King. But there is still a lack of men—the crisis of the battle now demands an immediate general draft throughout the entire church of Christendom. When General Stonewall Jackson was dying, in his delirium he imagined that he was commanding a bloody fight and he called out from his bed: "*Order A. P. Hill to prepare for action! Advance ALL the infantry to the front rapidly!*" The Christian Church is in the thick of the contest; "now is the crisis of this world" [John 12: 31] and the command of Jehovah Jesus sounds forth: "Go ye into all the world!" Advance *all the infantry to the front rapidly!*

The subject assigned us has many phases. A paper could be written on what the Lay-Element *has* done for Missions or on what they *are* doing, but the limits of this paper will not allow such general treatment. We will, therefore, leave the past and turn our attention to the future except for the sake of illustration or argument. This paper must, therefore, necessarily be suggestive rather than exhaustive in its treatment of the subject. A consideration of the following questions will serve as an analysis to so wide a topic:

- I. Why and How should Laymen be employed as Evangelists?
- II. What are the Attendant Dangers or Difficulties?
- III. What other spheres of Mission work are open for Laymen?

IV. How shall the Lay-Element be made to Work in these Lines?

Let us briefly define the two words "Lay-element" and "Missions." By *laymen* we understand all those belonging to the Church who are not specially ordained for preaching the word and dispensing the sacraments. We use the word in its widest sense. By *missions* we mean all aggressive effort to bring the gospel or gospel influence to those destitute in the Home or Foreign Field.

I. *Why and How should Laymen be Employed as Evangelists?* The employment of laymen as evangelists without special ordination finds authority in Scripture and support in the history of the early Church. The commission of discipling all nations was probably given to 500 brethren at once and not to the apostles only. Each disciple is to be a witness, not in a vague general sense, but distinctly and verbally must he publish the story of the gospel. "Go tell thy friends what great things God has done for thee." "All are to go and to go to all." In the 8th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles we read: "Then they that were scattered abroad went everywhere *evangelizing*." (see Greek). These include those not apostles. Stephen and Philip, who were not ordained to preach, but to "serve tables," not only preached, but even baptized; and the strongest proof that the early Church was pan-evangelistic is in the fact of its rapid growth. The "Go ye" of Christ, echoed from Olivet to Jerusalem, to Antioch, and from there, within two centuries, over the world-empire. When this evangelistic movement ceased, and a self-seeking hierarchy took its place, we have the beginning of the dark ages.

But the question is not solely one of authority. It is sometimes true, even in the Church, that "necessity knows no law." It certainly would be most desirable to supply every part of the field with the best qualified and ordained ministers and missionaries; but the best thing ideally is not always the best practically. Faithful preaching by laymen is better than no preaching at all. One hundred thousand heathen die every

day, who have never known the distinction between laymen and clergy—*without Christ, without hope!* When the disciples say, "Send the multitudes away," or, Let them wait, do you not hear the Master's word: "Give ye them to eat"? If not the pure wheaten bread of the learned, at least the rye-loaf of a home-spun preacher! And not only does the need of the field call for lay evangelists, but God's blessing rests unmistakably to-day upon the work of lay preachers, both in the Home and Foreign Field. It is, indeed, an unfortunate thing for a church if she have no place according to law and order for the gifts of such men as Moody and Whittle; but you can meet this so-called irregular evangelism, not by opposition, but only by incorporation. How to make these bush-whackers and guerilla bands fight under the church standards is the question in some quarters. When *that* is answered, the more of them the better.

As to qualification and preparation needed for such lay evangelists, there is great difference of opinion. Preparation for service in the King's army can never be too thorough, and yet His business "demands haste." Here is the dilemma. With no preparation at all, total failure is apt to result. God has decreed to use the "*foolishness of preaching*" "to save them that believe;" but this does not mean *foolish preaching* or *foolish preachers*.

Again, the Church can require qualifications so exacting that lay evangelist becomes only another name for a regularly ordained preacher. A golden mean should be sought. The words of Dr. S. L. Baldwin, of the Methodist Church, are of worth, as he speaks from long experience: "I would advise that lay evangelists be specially instructed in the Scriptures and the best methods of evangelical work. Nothing for that purpose is better than attendance at Moody's school at Northfield, Mass. I would also advise some experience in City Mission work." Says Rev. Morgan Dix: "The best special training for lay evangelists would be the study of the Holy Scriptures under proper guidance, with some simple studies in sys-

tematic theology, and, I should add, a close and careful study of the Book of Common Prayer." Dr. Herrick Johnson recommends that a special course of instruction for "lay workers" should be marked out by authority and taught by the best practical pastors in all parts of the country, especially in our large cities.

Aside from all preparation, however, only such laymen should be employed who clearly have a Divine call, in a preparation of heart and life, for this work. The man whom God uses must not only be *good*, but *good for something*. The second question to be considered is,—

II. *What are the Attendant Dangers or Difficulties in Employing Laymen as Evangelists?* We cannot blind our eyes to the fact that such there are; but we have only time to mention some of them, and not to discuss cause or cure:

(1.) That lay evangelists are apt to work independently of church authority, doctrine or discipline, and so may bring dishonor on the cause of Christ.

(2.) That they may go beyond their proper sphere and become ruling instead of subordinate. Headstrong and presuming workers are often more of a hindrance than a help.

(3.) That, from lack of thorough preparation, they will preach, not the whole truth, but a fragmentary, popular gospel, and so deceive themselves and those that hear them.

(4.) That in the Foreign Field, with its complications of salary and native pastors, etc., jealousy and discord may arise. Here also lay evangelists would be specially tempted to accept salaried positions, which would divert them from the great object in view.

Such are some of the apparent difficulties; but although great, they are not insurmountable nor wholly confined to the lay element in mission work. They have, moreover, been over-estimated. In the 11th chapter of Numbers (vs. 25-29), we read of one who was opposed to the lay work of Eldad and Medad, and said to Moses: "My lord, forbid them." "And Moses said unto him, Enviest thou for my sake? Would to

God that *all* the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put His Spirit upon them!" *Would that to-day all Christians were Eldads and Medads, and that we could send a ship-load of such workers to each mission field on the globe!*

III. The third question is: *What other Spheres of Mission Work are open to Laymen?* Better, perhaps, to ask, What spheres of work are *not* open to laymen? John Pounds, the consecrated cobbler, unknown to fame and earning his bread at the bench, loved children. He would run after a ragged and hungry urchin, and win its trust by putting a hot roast potato under its nose! By such methods of lay work he became the Father of Ragged Schools, and personally saved at least 500 children from vice and ruin. In 1835, at Hamburg, seven shoemakers resolved to become lay mission-workers. Within twenty years they had organized 50 churches, gathered 10,000 converts, scattered 500,000 Bibles and 8,000,000 pages of tracts, and preached the gospel to 50,000,000 of people. Let these examples suffice; for time would fail us to speak of Wilberforce and Shaftsbury, Gough and Noble, Murphy and Dodge, Morley and Lawrence, in Christian lands, and such laymen as Murray in China, "who through faith wrought righteousness, obtained the promises, and out of weakness were made strong."

However, to enumerate, laymen can be active, (1) in *Benevolent Work in all its Branches*,—winning the hearts of men by opening purse-strings, visitation of poor, charity organizations, guilds, etc.; (2) *Medical Work*, in its various departments, both in the Home and Foreign Field, in hospitals and dispensaries, with physicians and nurses and the establishment of medical training schools, such as those at Edinburgh and New York; (3) *Bible Distribution*,—the founding of societies and the distribution of Bibles, books and tracts, the employment of colporteurs and Bible readers, the general use of ink, paste-pot and shears in flooding the world with the gospel message and the missionary spirit; we want missionary editors, authors and advertisers—the whole mighty influence of the

press—until even the printer's devil is harnessed to God's chariot; (4) *Educational Work*,—Sunday and day schools everywhere, and colleges such as Roberts and the Christian College of Beirut; the establishment of Missionary Training Institutes, like that of Grattan Guinness at London, and schools for the *industrial* training of missionaries, like the one built last year by the French Protestants at Paris; (5) *The Christian Colony*, with all its civilizing and Christianizing adjuncts. Liberia is but an example. Why should the whiskey-dealer and the slave-trader be on the ground before the Christian merchant or pioneer farmer? Lastly—and this touches all of the above—*Whole-souled, munificent giving* to the cause of Christ. Every layman can and ought to minister to God of his substance. *The lay element should see to the PAY element in missions.* Have you ever read the image and superscription on our American dollar? "In God we trust." If you trust God on your dollar, trust Him *with* your dollar, and give "to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, but to God the things that are God's." Stonewall Jackson, from the thick of the battle of Bull Run, sent to his pastor at home a letter containing these words: "I remember that next Sunday is the day upon which collection is taken for foreign missions. Inclosed find my check." Oh, for more of that *Stonewall* element in Christian giving!

IV. *How, finally, shall this Lay-Element be made to work in these various spheres?* Notice first that the laity can be organized so that each member does his part as well as the pastor in Mission Work. Dr. Goodell, of St. Louis, so trained and organized his church that when he was suddenly taken away the work went on without interruption.

What *has* been done, can be done. To interest and engage all laymen in mission work we need (1) Inspiration, (2) Organization, (3) Consecration. The first *must* come from the leaders of the people. Like priest like people. Each pastor should inspire the flock by word and example in all lines of missionary activity. Above all he should make the laity un-

derstand that their help is WANTED—that God does not accept work done *by proxy*, but that each believer should “present *his* body a living sacrifice” to the Cause of Christ. It is still too true, as Carey said, that “the greatest obstacle to Missions is the indifference of the Pastors at home.” . . . Next, *Organization*. This, also, is the duty of the ministry, and it is no light task. The cause of Missions demands organization of all the forces for personal gospel effort. To attempt to reach the masses by preaching only is like trying to fill a row of bottles by standing at a distance and throwing water at them. A few drops may go in, but most is spilt on the ground. If you want to fill the bottles you must take *them one by one by the neck, and pour water into them*. Organization of all church-members for *world-wide button-hole gospel-preaching is the real way of reaching the masses*. But this can never be done in human strength; we therefore need (3) *Consecration* in pulpit and pew, among clergy and laity; let us stop idly using the *word*, but on our knees seek the reality. A living holocaust of all our powers on the altar of Obedience!—“Go ye into all the World”—Such an altar sanctifies the gift! . . . Oh, for *Inspiration* that will stir among the dead bones of our churches, *Organization* that will set them on their feet, *life-consecration* breathed into each believer by the Almighty Spirit! . . . Who will arise like Peter the Hermit, aflame with *these* facts, and set all the church of the Living God ablaze in service?

My brother, layman or preacher, learn a lesson from lowly Amos: “I was neither a prophet nor a prophet’s son . . . I was a herdman. . . . But the Lion hath roared. God hath spoken, *who can but prophesy?*”

The Lion of Judah roars to-day. In the face of the miraculous display of divine power in Missions—seeing the divine enthusiasm of Our Omnipotent Leader—shall we suffer or sanction any laymen to be latent in our midst? “*Awake, Awake! Put on thy strength, O Zion! and all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God.*”

VIII.

SIMON BARJONA—THE STONE AND THE ROCK.

“Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.”

CHAPTER I.

A LIVING STONE.

“Thou art Simon, the Son of Jonas : thou shalt be called Cephas, (A stone).”
—St. John i : 42.

§ 1. *The Jewish Messiah.*

THIRTY years had passed since the Annunciation, and thirty years had Jesus been subject to His parents, when the set time arrived for the Messiah to be “made manifest unto Israel,” God having chosen the house of Jacob to give to the world “the Desire of all nations.”

By nature as well as by grace an Israelite, indeed, in whom was no guile, He had been, till the time of His baptism, passive and submissive only. Henceforth He was also to be active in abundant good works, and aggressive against every form of sin and evil. As soon, therefore, as He had been anointed and illuminated by His baptism, and strengthened and confirmed by His temptation, He began the work for which He had been born of man and sent of God. This was twofold, and comprised two offices—those of Saviour and Mediator. By His birth, life and death, He was to gather up and fulfill in Himself all the Jewish types and prophecies concerning the Messiah as a sacrifice for sin, and die as a Saviour. And by His resurrection, ascension and glorification, and coming again in the Spirit, He was to lay the foundation of, and build up, the new

church destined to supersede the old, and further be known in it as a Mediator. Hence the double meaning of His name—"Jesus"—the "Saviour" of the old covenant, and the "Mediator" of the new.

Though the Jewish church went down virtually at the martyrdom of John the Baptist, the last and greatest but One of its prophets, it was really closed, completed and crowned by the condemnation and crucifixion of its Messiah. As He was the germ, so was He also the flower and fruit of its inward and outward ritual; and while the Jews wilfully put Him to death, He, by His voluntary submission to that death, closed it actively as well as passively; for no man took His life from Him. Of his own will He laid it down for the first purpose, and took it up again for the second—the opening of the Christian Church. Indeed for this double purpose had He come into the world. He who "shutteth and no man openeth," who was the Angel or Messenger of the old dispensation, and God's vicegerent, had come to close the door of His Father's Church to a nation of unbelievers, and take from them their bishopric and place. And as the reward of this filial act, He who also "openeth and no man shutteth," who was the Man and Lord of the new dispensation, was afterward to open wide His own, the Son's Church, to a world of sinners, and give the discarded bishopric and place of His people to nations that knew Him not. And having had the foundation for this work laid broad and deep in the wonderful derivation of His person, and carried it on in His submission to baptism and temptation, He was proceeding (at the time Simon met Him) in His work, by calling disciples, of whom, and to whom, He might, after His death and ascension, build and entrust the building of the New Church, the Church which was to be of His own name and body or life.

At this juncture, Andrew, the son of Jonas, and John the son of Zebedee, neighbors and life-long friends, and both disciples of John the Baptist, seeing Him as he walked, followed and visited Him; and Andrew, who saw at once that the gracious manner of Jesus would win the heart of his brother Simon far

quicker than the austere address of John, rested not till he had led and made him acquainted with one who was not only attractive in Himself, but who, he was persuaded, was indeed their long-promised and long-expected Messiah, in whom, as being of His own blood, every Jew felt that he had a special and individual right. And Jesus, who was in a far higher and nobler sense enthusiastic as Simon, when He beheld him, exclaimed: "Thou art Simon, the son of Jonas: thou shalt be called *Cephas!*" ("which," the evangelist adds, "is by interpretation, *A stone.*")

Or, to introduce the characters in the precise words of Scripture: "Again the next day after John (the Baptist) stood, and two of his disciples; and looking upon Jesus as he walked, he saith, Behold the Lamb of God!" By which he meant the Paschal Lamb, destined in the Jewish Church as a sacrifice for sin; for John had added the day before, "that taketh away the sin of the world," showing that he was looking on Jesus, not as the lamb eaten, but slain in the Passover. John knew nothing of the Christian Church, and hence only the first and Jewish idea was prominent to his mind. Of that "Flesh which is meat indeed," and that "Blood which is drink indeed," which the eating of it also typified, he had no conception, for the Lord's Supper had not yet been instituted. "And the disciples heard him speak, and they followed Jesus. Then Jesus turned and saw them following, and saith unto them, What seek ye? They said unto him, Rabbi (which is to say, being interpreted, Master) where dwellest thou? He saith unto them, Come and see. They came and saw where he dwelt, and abode with him that day: for it was about the tenth hour. One of the two which heard John speak, and followed him, was Andrew, Simon Peter's brother. He first findeth his own brother Simon, and saith unto him, We have found the Messiah, which is, being interpreted, the Christ. And he brought him to Jesus. And when Jesus beheld him, he said, Thou art Simon, the son of Jonas: thou shalt be called Cephas (which is by interpretation, *A stone.*)"

It is easy to imagine them in this interview as by Andrew they are presented to each other—the rude fisherman of the lake and the fair prince of the house of David—to see them as they meet—the stalwart and weather-beaten pilot of Tiberias, who has made haste to do homage to one whom his brother has assured him is their long-expected Messiah, and the majestic Rabbi, whose hospitable welcome is extended to all that choose to call, and of those who come selects disciples. It is easy to picture them as they greet each other for the first time—the lowly fisherman of Galilee, who is yet to become a mighty fisher of men, and the mysterious Prophet of Judea, who is destined to fill the country and the world with the fame of His wonderful words and deeds—the older man who has naught to recommend him to the princely stranger whom he regards with lively curiosity, but his honest and childlike and strongly affectionate disposition, and the younger man who regards with deep interest this new and unconscious applicant for his favor.

“And Jesus beheld him,” that is, looked at him intently. What a look that was!—second only to the one when he denied Him—Close and searching as the two-edged sword of the Spirit, it pierced to the depth of His being, and tender and loving as the everlasting arms of the Father, it encircled him with an embrace which was never again to be unloosed, for as Jesus looked at him the spirit of prophecy spake from his lips: “Thou art Simon the son of Jonas: thou shalt be called Cephas,” and the eternal welfare of Simon Peter was assured beyond recall. With that single word “Cephas” his Messiah had blessed, and blessing, bound him indissolubly to Himself.

§ 2. “*Thou shalt be called Cephas, a stone.*”

In examining this concluding sentence of Jesus' twofold greeting, it would not be fair to overlook the one that precedes it: “Thou art Simon, the son of Jonas.” Andrew was the son of Jonas, too. Why then the formal and exclusive repetition of his brother's name and parentage, if not to mark that which was to follow? He addressed Simon, not as the fisherman, nor Galilean, nor Andrew's brother, nor as the son of Jonas the

priest, or the Levite, or any other distinguishing title, but simply the son of Jonas the *man*, whether ordinary or extraordinary matters not. And why? Because Simon was the son, or born of the life of Jonas, who, like every other man, great or small, was a sinner by nature. Through his parents he was an inheritor of Adam's fallen life, and as such Christ was addressing him in the words: "Thou art Simon, the son of Jonas," and contrasting his life with His own as the inheritor of Adam's sinless life. But this was only the prelude to the second sentence, though very important, as it contains the key-note to the whole and double salutation. And now, in order to discover the meaning of this brief but comprehensive name and title of Cephas, or a Stone, as the prophet of Nazareth bestowed it in a prediction and promise, at first sight, on Simon, the son of Jonas, it will be necessary to go back to the Jewish Scriptures, of which Jesus was a thorough student.

The prophet Daniel, whom Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon, had called to his aid as an interpreter of dreams, is there represented as telling the king that in the vision which he had seen in his dream and forgotten, and concerning which he was so greatly and justly troubled, he "saw a stone cut out without hands," which "became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth."

Speaking of the Christ now as the prophet Jesus, who grew in knowledge and wisdom as He grew in stature, had He learned, in His study of the Scriptures, that this "stone" was a living stone, in representing a man? And had He also learned that in its being "cut out" it had been evolved from a source beyond human reach and, in being cut out "*without hands*," it had been produced by the direct agency of God? And had He also determined *what* this "Stone" was—that it was the Messiah, the long-promised Stone of Israel? And had He also become conscious *who* it was—that it was none other than Himself, whom God had declared at His baptism to be by creation and generation *His* Son? And had He further learned that in its becoming "a great mountain," it was

not only a living, but a *growing* stone, and that, in "filling the whole earth," it grew not alone by inward vital force, but outward aggregation also, and that, in so doing, it represented still further Himself and His united (they as the members and He as the head) and ever-growing and increasing Christian Church, in His and its self-same divine and human origin and progress?

If all this had been realized by Jesus the Christ, then was He ready to begin the work for which He had been sent into the world, the work of rearing a temple of living stones, of building out of sinful and mortal men a church, or family, of sinless and immortal men (through holding their life in Him), who should become with Him, their Parent and Head, a kingdom of prophets, priests and kings unto God,—who should become what Daniel interpreted this stone as representing in being so cut out, and so growing—a kingdom which God should set up on the earth, which should stand forever, and which should break in pieces and consume all the kingdoms of this world.

This being the case, it had become a necessity with Him to call disciples; or rather, to choose, first, who, out of the fallen men of earth, should be His sons. For this choosing and anointing being introduced by generation, a man must become a son of the Christ, as Christ was a Son of God, before he can become His prophet, priest and king. As with the sons of earthly kings, so with those of the heavenly, they must inherit the life of their father before they can inherit his name and office and titles; otherwise, they would be "bastards" and usurpers. And, therefore, as soon as the Messiah beheld him, He was able to salute Simon, the son of Jonas, as a Christian or anointed one, because He had, at that moment, chosen him to be His son, with those very words had made him a member of a church and kingdom and family, of which as yet no living being but himself knew. And thus, Simon, "Andrew's own brother," who knew nothing of the Christian religion, because ignorant of the person and work of the Messiah, and was conscious of himself as no other by birth than "a son of Jonas,"

and by religion than a Jew, His Messiah and King at the very first sight of him, saluted as one who was now His son and follower, and henceforth should be called such in the comprehensive name and title of a Christian!

But more than this He intimated by His earnest and public salutation—That he should be called such not only as one with many others, but in distinction from others. This may be seen in the fact that none of His succeeding disciples wore the title of a "stone" in the form of a personal name—"Cephas." Herein He signified His pleasure that, over and above all others, Simon should be called "*the*" Christian, or the first and greatest of these; greatest, not in point of holiness, but precedence, because first in the order of time or being; just as the first-born of a king is greater on that account than the succeeding sons or princes, and the first inheritor consequently of his father's name and kingdom and titles.

Now every reader of the New Testament knows that in a few years after this interview between Simon and his Messiah, the whole country of Judea was filled with the noise of the new Christian religion as it was preached by the apostles. The Jews were distracted because the worship of their fathers was in danger of being "subverted," and "the customs of Moses abolished," and strangers and foreigners were asking instruction in regard to it. Is it probable, then, that inquirers seeking him who was at the head of it, were directed, in order to distinguish him from others of the name of "Simon," to ask particularly for Simon *the Christian*? Certainly, the men who were sent from Caesarea to Joppa by Cornelius, to "call," according to the command of the angel, "for one, Simon, whose surname is Peter," when they had found "the house of the tanner," "stood before the gate, and called, and asked—not whether Simon *Barjona*—but whether Simon, which was '*surnamed Peter*,' were lodged there," and Peter signifies the same as Cephas, a stone (though indeed it is a stronger and more comprehensive word, inasmuch as it signifies a *foundation* stone, and hence may be called a *rock*), and Cephas or "Peter" in

his case, meant here, as a "surname" and not a title, the son of the Christ.

The Gentiles who understood not the import of the words, but obeying to the letter the direction of "the angel of God" to "call for Simon, whose surname is Peter," knocked loudly for Simon, the son of the Christ, who was to open to them the kingdom of heaven, or give them admission into the Christian Church, an act for which no *Jew*, not even Simon, the son of Jonas, as such, would have been qualified, and, consequently, for which no Jew would have been so visited and sought; and an act which none of the twelve apostles but Peter could have performed, none but him having received the promise of "the keys to the kingdom of heaven," or of establishing and enforcing in the Christian Church those distinctive ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, which their Messiah had instituted before His death, and after His resurrection entrusted to Peter in the impressive words, "Feed my sheep" and "Feed my lambs."

"Many widows were in Israel in the days of Elias, but unto none was Elias sent, but unto Sarepta, a city of Sidon, unto a woman that was a widow. And many lepers were in Israel in the time of Eliseus, the prophet; and none of them was cleansed saving Naaman, the Syrian." So twelve apostles there were, who, on the Day of Pentecost, were declared to be the sons of Christ with power. And Paul, the giant among the sons of God, had also been born by this time (the calling of the Gentiles), and was preaching Christ in every synagogue, but neither unto him nor any of the eleven did the Spirit of God command—"Send and *he* shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do." Unto none but "one Simon," "*surnamed Peter*," were these representatives of the heathen world sent, as to the first-born and eldest of all His children, to whom naturally this respect was due, and to whom, as such, His King and Father had said in the presence of his brethren, "And I will give unto *thee* the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven: and whatsoever *thou* shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever *thou* shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."

By establishing or enforcing, at its opening, baptism and the breaking of bread in the place of circumcision and the pass-over, Peter really did loose the Christian Church and bind the Jewish. In opening the first he closed the last, and finished the work their Lord began; and thus will these two dispensations remain "loosed" and "bound" till He whose sovereign right it is shall decree further.

If this cannot be disputed concerning the son of Jonas, or, if there be recorded in Scripture further sign or evidence that he was looked upon, during the earthly life of their Messiah, as first or chief of the disciples, or, after His ascension, as the most prominent of His apostles as actor, leader and speaker, or if, in the history of the world since, of all the twelve whom Jesus of Nazareth appointed to carry on His work, Simon Peter has by any been accounted the greatest, then has this prediction and promise of the Messiah, whose every word must come to pass though heaven and earth should fall, been literally fulfilled, for, "Thou, Simon the son of Jonas," He said, "Thou" (and no other) "shalt be called Cephas," or the first and greatest of all the Christians.

§ 3. *Andrew and Simon.*

When the brothers Andrew and Simon, on walking away from their visit to the Messiah, recalled His impressive and significant words to the latter, how they must have wondered what they meant! For, at that time, they knew not—and to appreciate the extent of their perplexity this must be borne in mind—that the Christ, though to be "the Son of David," was not to be an individual like every other member of the race, but (though having individuality in the sense of an own personality) that He was to be like the first Adam, before He was differentiated, in bearing the whole race in His loins, and as such was to die for it. They knew "salvation was of the Jews," but thought it was to be limited to the Jews. Neither did they know that after His death He was to rise again and become the second or new Adam and father of the race; that He was to die as its Son

and Saviour, and rise as its Father and Mediator; that, after having laid down His life to atone for the sin of the race, He was to take it up again and give it in regeneration to all such as should believe on Him. Of all these things they were profoundly ignorant; for these were as yet hid in the counsels of the Almighty. Nor did they know then, what they learned afterward, and every little Christian child knows from its birth—that their expected Messiah was to be God as well as man. It is true, one of their prophets had written—"His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father (or the Father of Eternity), the Prince of Peace;" but these, whatever their writers may have understood by them, the Jews of Messiah's day mistook to be titles only, designating His offices, not names descriptive of His person, or they "would not have crucified the Lord of glory." And Simon and Andrew were, like the rest of their countrymen—people and rulers, laity and clergy—lamentably deficient in a true understanding of their own Scriptures. This, however, was in the case of the former, because they had not yet become prophets whose "understanding should be opened," and the Christ of history was not yet completed. He had not died and risen; and could not, till then, "expound" to His chosen ones, to whom was to be revealed "the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven," "all the things in Moses and the prophets concerning himself," nor had the Holy Spirit been given, whose office it is to convince men of that presence of sin in their life, which alone necessitated the advent of the Messiah as a Redeemer. The prophecies and promises had to be made facts before they could become intelligible, and the Divine Interpreter be given. This was the object of His coming; so that, having life through faith in those promises, they "might have it more abundantly," through faith in Him their fulfillment.

What a puzzle then those words "Thou shalt be called Cephas (a stone)" must have been to the brothers! For they, too, were a promise and prophecy which was yet to be fulfilled. However, the giving of the name was not so significant as the

meaning of it. It was customary for prophets to call disciples by giving them a new name, and the brothers might have thought their Messiah meant Simon should be merely one of His many followers. Its meaning was the puzzle. "*A Stone!*" "Thou shalt be called a Stone!" What could it mean? For though doubtless acquainted with the Book of Daniel, they could not know that the "stone" of which that prophet speaks, and of which their Messiah was thinking, meant the Christ and His church, or the Messiah and His family. They knew not that His kingdom, any more than His person and that of His sons, was to be of heavenly origin, and, like this same "stone which grew till it became a great mountain and filled the whole earth," was destined finally to break in pieces and absorb all other kingdoms, solely because it was from heaven. They knew not that His family, being born, each member of it, directly of Him, would gather into it and make all the tribes and kindreds and families of the earth of one tongue and one blood. They entertained the prevailing Jewish idea that both were to last forever, and be, not supernatural and spiritual, but only and always temporal and earthly. How mistaken, then, if they thought He was calling Simon merely as a teacher calls disciples, or even as a king about to assert his title and claim his throne, calls adherents!

To Christians, however, who can visit the Messiah now as man and God, and understand His words as they could not then, is it not as if He whom Simon had hastened to salute in His earthly character as "the Son of David" and his temporal king, had laid His hand on the head of the lowly fisherman, and (with that look which this disciple especially never could resist) saluted Him in His heavenly character of Father and Redeemer of men, and blessing, said: "Simon, hitherto thou hast been, and been called, 'the son of the man Jonas;' but from henceforth thou art, and shalt be called '*the Son of Him who is God as well as man, the Son of Jesus the Christ—MY SON?*'"

And thus, to express it briefly and plainly, in naming him at first sight Cephas, and afterward surnaming him Peter, the

Messiah was not referring to "the natural boldness of Simon's character," nor "the rock-like strength of his belief," nor "his habitual firmness," nor "his future activity," nor any natural qualities in him whatever. On the contrary, by the former, "Cephas," he was honoring and commemorating the fact that of all the sons of Adam fallen, he was, and should yet be acknowledged, the first partaker of the life of Adam unfallen; and by the latter, "Peter," that with this life he had also been the first to receive the life of "the Son of the living God" incarnate in him.

But though not emphasizing particularly any good qualities that had characterized his past, or would distinguish his future, yet, as the inevitable result of the new life would not only be to create, but strengthen and develop such dormant and natural qualities, Simon Peter did, eventually, prove firm and stable and enduring as a rock, winning at last the crown of martyrdom, but it was chiefly because of Christ's assurance that, while now a Christian in name and nature, he should grow to become one in deed and in truth.

§ 4. *Propriety of the Naming and of the Name.*

Only in the light of this interpretation was the public re-naming of Simon Barjona befitting the dignity of the Christ. The birth of the first son of the incarnate Lord was worthy of a special prophecy. Under the old dispensation John the Baptist was described as "the Voice of one crying in the wilderness," and "the Messenger of the Lord;" but under the new, was given to Simon Barjona His titles and names as a promise and prophecy of his own destiny, it is true, but further, as an allegory, by searching for the meaning of which men might find and know Christ Himself, the great Stone and the great Rock from whence this lesser one was hewn. The peculiar glory of the Messiah's church, the Psalmist had foretold, should be that men would be "*born*" in her. What more proper than at birth they should be named? And what more fitting than, being born of the essential life of Him who is the head of that body

of which they are the members, they should be called Christians after His name, not merely as it describes His offices, "Anointed" Prophet, Priest and King, but chiefly as it denotes His essence—Man and God? For, though all His people inherit His offices, not all, in this world, enter into them; "many" being "called," but "few" chosen; whereas all, both small and great, are here, without exception, partakers of His life; otherwise, they could not be saved.

It was the custom in those days, as in these, for parents to call their children after themselves. The neighbors and cousins of Elizabeth insisted on calling her son "Zacharias," "after the name of his father," and objected to calling him "John," because "none of his kindred were of that name." But as the son of Elizabeth would never have been born but for the Holy Ghost, the Lord who called him into being had already provided his name; and, accordingly, his father, while yet speechless on account of his unbelief, wrote—"His name is JOHN." "Jehovah's gift" and "The Lord is gracious," the name John is generally interpreted, and as a son born to take away the reproach of his parents, and a prophet to be the herald of the Messiah, John the Baptist was, indeed, to his parents and the whole Jewish nation, the gracious gift of God. Besides, sons inherit the surnames of their father more inalienably than his titles and estate. Of these they may be dispossessed, but never of the name that stands for the life. How much more, then, should the sons of Christ's life be called by His name, especially the eldest, who was to be His first representative son. Plainly the Prophet of Nazareth thought thus, for, as soon as He foresaw his re-birth, He gave the son of Jonas his corresponding surname.

It was eminently proper that the new kingdom and its subjects should be suitably designated. The old, which was passing away, had been known as the kingdom of Israel, and its people as "Israelites"; and, the new, superseding it, was to be known as the kingdom of Jesus Christ, and its members as "Christians." They were called after His name of Christ, and not after His

name of Jesus, though Dr. Donne writes: "And before they had this name at Antioch" (Christians) "they were called (most likely from the name of Jesus) *Jesseans*. And so Philo Judæus, in that book that he writes, *De Jessenis*, intends by his *Jessenis*, Christians; and in divers parts of the world, into which Christians travel now, they find some elements, some fragments, some relics of the Christian religion in the practice of some religious men, whom those countries call *Jesseans*, doubtlessly derived and continued from the name of Jesus." *

They are not called after His name of Jesus, though it, too, is, like Christ, both specific and generic—generic, *man*; and specific, *sinless* man (from the very beginning of His life). But they are called after His name of Christ, because that implies: first, that He is Jesus, this sinless Son of man by the direct interposition of the Holy Ghost; and, second, it is used to express His eternal generation from God. It is therefore doubly generic, and His people wear it thus in partaking of His life, as He is both the God-created Son of man, and the generated or "begotten" Son of God incarnate, the Stone and the Rock. Jesus is likewise doubly generic, meaning man created and man eternal, and for this reason His names are written equally "Jesus Christ" and "Christ Jesus," though in both cases the last is generally emphatic. Jesus being also His personal and individual name, as it further signifies that He was born a "Saviour" and a "Mediator," He not only retained for Himself, but when He re-named His first disciple and son, he retained his individual name too. "And *Simon* he *surnamed* Peter." He cast not away his personal name of Simon, but only his generic or family name of Jonas, to intimate that he was re-born of another life, and into another family. As Cephas and Peter, the stone and the rock, he was to be but one of many, though the chief; and, therefore, as the most important of these, his name was henceforth "*Simon* PETER." And "Simon" Jesus always called him, except in the three in-

* Donne's Works, Sermon cix.

stances when he said, "Thou art Peter;" and, "I tell thee, Peter, the cock shall not crow this day before thou shalt thrice deny that thou knowest me;" and, "Arise, Peter, slay and eat."

And now, since they are, with so much propriety, not called Jesseans, and are called Christians, did they receive this name by chance, or by the will of God? If they obtained it merely through derision, as a title of reproach from their enemies, why did not those, who hated the name of Jesus, call them as quickly by this name as by the other? They preached Jesus as much as Christ, and it would have been more opprobrious to be called the follower of a crucified person, than of a Divine one. Dr. Donne further writes: "Christians, among themselves, were called by divers names in the Primitive church for distinction; *Fideles*, the Faithful, and *Fratres*, the Brethren, and *Discipuli*, Disciples; and after, by common custom at Antioch, Christians. And after that (they say) by a council which the apostles held at the same city, at Antioch, there was passed an express canon of the church that they should be called so, Christians." *

It is true they were not formally, and as a body named Christians by their Lord before nor after His death and resurrection; it would have been premature. But no doubt this "express canon of the church" was prompted by that same Spirit of the Lord which impelled Jesus to say to Simon Barjona, "Thou shalt be called Cephias (a Stone)." Simon was named not only individually, but representatively, and in giving him his own title of "Anointed" prophet, priest and king, the Messiah settled the like *title* on every one of His succeeding disciples. And as He at the same time received him as His first-born son into the new family of man and God about to be set up on earth, He also, under the figurative name of a stone, fixed the like *name* of a Christian for every succeeding son.

* § 5. *Christ the Lord perfect God and perfect man.*

Thus the term "Christian," as a *title*, signifies not merely one who has become a follower of Christ, but has likewise been

* Serm. cix.

made His prophet, priest and king, through that "anointing with the Holy Ghost," whereby his eyes have been opened to see his lost condition as a sinner by nature, and recognize the Holy Scriptures, old and new, as the Word of God, and been enabled to profess his faith in Christ as a Saviour, and live according to His commandments; and last, but not least, to bring others to Christ as Andrew brought Simon to Jesus. But as a *name*, it further signifies that the person so described has also been "born" by the Holy Ghost, a son of the Christ whose life was constituted by the union of two lives—man's and God's. Hence though but one life, it is two-fold—two-fold in its nature, the life of man being created, and temporary or changeable, the life of God uncreated and eternal and unchangeable—two-fold also in its essence, the essence of man's life and the essence of God's being what their natures make them, wholly distinct, and yet (as united in him) but *one*, because the same "*kind*" of life, in these essences being alike in quality—*human*, and alike in form—*triune*, so that when the Son of God would become incarnate, it was but proper and natural that He should seek a resting-place in the womb of the Virgin, and be born the "Son of *man*." He only followed thus His own first rule of "Every creature after its *kind*."

"Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," are the words of Christ. "And I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ" are the words of St. Paul. Christ would not have commanded men to be baptized in the name of the Trinity, if man had not been created triune, and by baptism man becomes again like the first Adam before Eve was made, and the last Adam before his death, undifferentiated, so that "in Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female, but all are one." Jesus was the Son of man, not like any other son of man, but like Adam before Eve was taken out of him, and their child out of them.

It is to be particularly noted that His life was not made up of only a *part* of the created, and a *part* of the uncreated sources

from whence it came, for then it would not have been true God's nor true man's, but a nondescript life answering to neither. And, therefore, it was not constituted by "the intimate and complete union" of "the human and the divine natures" alone—(or rather, since both essences are *human*)—of the temporary and eternal natures alone; but of their created and uncreated essences also. The union of the natures would have been impossible without the union of their essences. The essence and nature are equal constituents of God's life, and as of God's, so of man's. Only thus, and consequently, Christ the Lord was born of the *whole* life of God and the *whole* life of man, and so was perfect God and perfect man.

That "bond," "the union of the human and the divine," or rather the temporal and eternal "natures" in Christ was not the *lasting* bond of his personality. Nor was merely the *union* of the created and uncreated essences such. By His death the union of His natures was severed, and His temporary or mortal nature was in Him personally changed into immortal, and thus "swallowed up" forever; and its corresponding essence would have been the same had it been in quality and form different from or less than His uncreated essence. But Jesus, though no longer a mortal man as to nature, is still a true created man as to essence, and will remain such, "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever." Indeed, without this *precise similarity* in the quality and form of the essences, the union of the two natures could not have taken place. However, the Lord uncreated and eternal did become incarnate in man, created and temporal, and, as a Saviour, even in man mortal, and this *very similarity* being the *lasting bond of His personality*, made it "one single and undivided." In spite of the essences of His life being drawn from two sources—God and man—and being consequently wholly unequal and diverse in their natures, their inherent and constitutional likeness made Him not two persons, but one person; one and inseparable as to essences, though separable as to natures. And this "likeness to," or "image of," or equality with Him-

self, in which God originally "made man," alone enabled the created essence of Jesus the Christ to remain in the uncreated, and take upon itself the eternal nature of the latter, when its own temporary and mortal nature yielded to the strain of death.

This similarity, then, (in quality and form of the essences), must be held as the sheet-anchor of the incarnation, for God will not unite lives different in their "kind," nor can He *beget* anything *foreign* to Himself. Besides, without its presence there, men would be holding to nothing more than a temporary and even a fantastic possession, and could have no right to look for the resurrection, and ascension, and session of "the Son of man at the right hand of God," nor His coming to judgment. And all this Christianity really is; or, even what the Jews of Messiah's day affirmed—"blasphemy." Indeed, the only effectual safeguard against the possibility of conceiving "a double Christ" on the one hand, and a "confounding of His natures" on the other, is the holding of this same essential likeness of man and God. For it, and it only, in the first instance, solves the "mystery" of Christ's being as both, and determines the possibility, and reasonableness, and actuality of His *one* personality or *single* self-consciousness. And, in the second instance, it preserves the true distinction of His natures, and explains why Christ (seemingly) "on account of the union of both natures attributed to one what belonged to the other." Seemingly—since the attributing was made only incidentally to His natures, for these being diverse and unequal and separable, they would have been confounded by an actual attributing. This was done really to His essences, because on account of their precise similarity, and through their *consequent indissoluble union*, they made Him, always and forever in His own thought, and in reality, but one, a single and harmonious personality. The essence and the nature of man's life are two things, and separable, and therefore likewise not to be confounded, but distinguished between; for even God, though He can change the mortal nature and sinful character of man's

essence, can never change the essence itself, since in respect of quality and form He made it like His own.

And further, it is evident that this similarity or "likeness" also responds to the following:—"If it be granted that the finite is capable of receiving the infinite"), "the question then becomes, How, without commixture and confusion, and without detriment to, nay, more, in virtue of the distinction of their essence, divine and human can be connected in Christ?"*—the finite life having been made, as shown by the actual incarnation, from the very "beginning" in this "image of God" for the express purpose of receiving the infinite life as its complement and perfection.

So also, were not man's "vile" life equal to his Redeemer's glorious life in the strength of a triune self-consciousness, it could not, when laid hold on by His in regeneration, and made to pass through all the changes and conditions of his, preserve throughout, intact, its own individual identity. The self-consciousness of man is as indestructible as his essence is unchangeable. In this, too, he is always equal with God, is already divine. The nature and character alone of his life are changed by regeneration. And the character in becoming sinless and holy, and the nature immortal and eternal, through the working of Christ's life, makes man still more divine, or "as," in the sense of "like" God.

As the essence of the Redeemer's time-created life, now also eternal in its nature, remains in the essence of His eternally begotten life, and the strength of its triunity preserves the self-identity of the man Jesus intact, it shows itself, as He is the last Adam once mortal, outwardly in His human form of body, and inwardly in His sympathy and oneness with all His people who share His life on earth. "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest." And "Inasmuch as ye did it to one of the least of these, my brethren, ye did it to me." While this same identifying Himself with His people, so that when they are persecuted, He is, and

*Dorner's *Doctrines of the Person of Christ*. Div. II., Vol. II., p. 245.

when loved, He is, also teaches that His life is in them as a father's is in his children, since they, His "brethren," are the children of God only as God's life comes to them through and from Him.

It is consistent, then, that in giving to believers of His life as He is perfect God and perfect man, by which they become in deed and in truth His sons, He should also give to them all, without exception, His "name of Christ," that they may be known by the world as such, and ever remember to strive after holiness and "depart from iniquity." Nevertheless, as the first aggregation and development of Himself, the stone cut out of the mountain without hands and destined to increase and fill the whole earth, to Simon Barjona only, He gave it as an exclusively personal name, in the words, "Thou shalt be called Cephas," a "lively" or "living stone."

IX.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

WHITHER? A Theological Question for the Times. By Charles Augustus Briggs, D.D., Davenport Professor of Hebrew and the Cognate Languages in the Union Theological Seminary. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1889. Price, \$1.75.

Of the theological works published during the past year, this is one of the most noteworthy. Though prepared more especially with reference to the action taken in May last by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America with regard to the revision of the Confession of Faith, yet nevertheless it will be found interesting and valuable by Christians of all denominations on account of the broad and thorough manner in which the points at issue are discussed.

The substance of the book is divided into ten chapters. In the opening chapter Dr. Briggs calls attention to the important fact that there is a wide-spread dissatisfaction with the Old Theology and the old methods of worship and church work, and that all Christian denominations have drifted from their standards, and are drifting at the present time. In Chapter Second he discusses, in a very vigorous manner, the subject of Orthodoxy, which he defines as "right thinking about the Christian religion." Some of the statements of this chapter are startling on account of their boldness. In the six chapters that follow and make up the body of the book, the Westminster standards are used as the test of orthodoxy, and it is clearly proved that modern Presbyterianism has more or less departed from those standards all along the line. In Chapter Ninth the doctrines that divide the churches and the barriers to Christian union are considered; and then, in the concluding chapter, the ideal to which all Christians should direct their efforts is pointed out. "True unity," Dr. Briggs ably maintains, "is to be attained by conserving all that is good in the past achievements of the Church and by advancing to still higher attainments." Therefore he holds, "Christian churches should go right on in the lines drawn by their own history and their own symbols."

The book, as Dr. Briggs himself states in his preface, is historical, polemical, irenical and catholic in its character. In style it is unusually clear and vigorous. Though we cannot accept all its

positions as correct, and are disposed to think that, in some cases at least, the author's own theological views have unduly affected his interpretation of the Westminster standards, yet we would nevertheless recommend it to our readers as well worth their attention and study. It is a book to make one think, and abounds in important truths, which ought to claim the serious consideration of all who are interested in the progress of Christianity.

ESSAYS UPON HEREDITY AND KINDRED BIOLOGICAL PROBLEMS. By Dr. August Weismann, Professor in the University of Freiburg in Breisgau. Authorized Translation. Edited by Edward B. Poulton, M.A., F.L.S., F.G.S., Tutor of Keble College, Oxford, Lecturer in Natural Science, Jesus College, Oxford; Selmar Schönland, Ph.D., Sub-Curator of the Fielding Hebraium in the University of Oxford, and Arthur E. Shipley, M.A., F.L.S., Fellow and Lecturer of Christ's College, Cambridge, Demonstrator of Comparative Anatomy in the University of Cambridge. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 1889. New York: Scribner & Welford. Price, \$4.00.

This book is made up of essays which have been published separately at various intervals during the course of the last eight years, but which, nevertheless, are closely connected together, in that they all tend to show that *acquired character* cannot be transmitted by heredity. They are now presented to the public for the first time in the form of a single volume. All these essays have attracted the marked attention of biologists and men of science, and are of the highest importance in their bearing upon the theory of evolution. Romanes, the well-known author of "Mental Evolution in Man" and other noted scientific works, calls them "a remarkable series of papers, the effects of which have been to create a new literature of such large and rapidly increasing proportions that, with the single exception of Mr. Darwin's own works, it does not appear that any publications in modern times have given so great a stimulus to speculative science or succeeded in gaining so influential a following." The essays are eight in number, and treat of the following subjects: The Duration of Life, Heredity, Life and Death, The Continuity of the Germ-plasm as the Foundation of a Theory of Heredity, The Significance of Sexual Reproduction in the Theory of Natural Selection, The Number of Polar Bodies and their Significance in Heredity, The Supposed Botanical Proofs of the Transmission of Acquired Characters, and the Supposed Transmission of Mutilations. Scholars generally will find these essays, without exception, unusually interesting and valuable, though some of them are too technical for the general reader. Their central thought is wide-reaching in its consequences, and, if proved to be correct, will affect not only biology, but philosophy and social science as well. We would yet add that the translation of all the essays is remarkably well done.

MAN AND HIS MALADIES; OR, The Way to Health. A Popular Hand-book of Physiology and Domestic Medicine in Accord with the Advance in Medical Science. By A. E. Bridger, B.A., M.D., B.Sc., F.R.C.P.E., Author of "The Demon of Dyspepsia," "Biliousness," "Diet in Epilepsy," "Epitome of Two Hundred Cases of Typhoid Fever," etc. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1889. Price, \$2.00.

It has been said that the man who is his own physician has a fool for a patient. In this saying there is undoubtedly much truth. At best a man is generally a poor judge of himself, and, knowing this, a wise man will, therefore, when afflicted with disease, always desire to submit himself for treatment to the judgment of some other properly qualified person. But, nevertheless, every man should have some knowledge concerning the nature of his physical constitution and the maladies to which it is liable. Such knowledge it is the object of the volume now before us to furnish. A careful examination of its contents convinces us that it is most admirably suited to the intended purpose. The information which it gives is truly in accord with the advance in medical science, and is just such as every intelligent person should possess. It is, indeed, one of the very best books of its kind, and ought to find a place in every household. A careful study of its teachings can scarcely fail to dispel many popular errors as regards the diseases which flesh is heir to, and to guide in the way of health.

THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS. By the Rev. Marcus Dods, D.D. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 714 Broadway. 1889. Price, \$1.50.

This volume is not in the strict sense of the term a commentary, but a collection of expository chapters or lectures, in which the epistle of which it treats is practically explained in a way admirably suited to supply the wants of the general reader. It belongs to the series known as "The Expositor's Bible," the earlier volumes of which have heretofore been noticed in this REVIEW. Of the volumes of the series so far published, it is, in our opinion, one of the most interesting and instructive. This is due, in part, to the character of the epistle of which it treats, in which the Great Apostle to the Gentiles considers some of the most difficult, practical and doctrinal questions which again and again claim the attention of every Church; and in part to the vigorous and original manner in which Dr. Dods discusses the Apostle's teachings in this Epistle. In his exposition of them there is nothing dull or weak. On the contrary he deals with them in an unusually pointed and forcible manner, and shows their applicability to the Churches of to day. His book is consequently exceedingly readable and valuable, and we would heartily commend it to our readers as well worthy their attention.

IMAGO CHRISTI: The Example of Jesus Christ. By Rev. James Stalker, M.A., Author of "The Life of Jesus Christ," "The Life of St. Paul," etc. Introduction by Rev. Wm. M. Taylor, D.D., LL.D. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 714 Broadway. 1889. Price, \$1.50.

This is an admirable book and is "equally fitted," as Dr. Taylor well says in his brief Introduction, "to be a companion for the closet and a directory for the life." Its author is one of the most distinguished of the younger ministers of the Free Church of Scotland, and is, at present, we believe, the highly esteemed pastor of Free St. Matthew's Church, Glasgow. In preparing himself for the ministry he prosecuted his studies not only in his native land, but also for some time in Germany. He is well known as the author of very valuable and suggestive hand-books on the "Life of Christ" and the "Life of St. Paul." The present work is no less meritorious than those which have preceded it.

The contents of the book are divided into seventeen chapters. The first is introductory and treats of Thomas à Kempis' *Imitation of Christ*. In the sixteen chapters that follow Christ is exhibited in order as He showed Himself in the home, in the state, in the Church, as a friend, in society, as a man of prayer, as a student of Scripture, as a worker, as a sufferer, as a philanthropist, as a winner of souls, as a preacher, as a teacher, as a controversialist, as a man of feeling, and as an influence. The work throughout is written in a clear and attractive style, and abounds in very edifying and suggestive thought.

THE GOSPEL IN THE BOOK OF NUMBERS. By Rev. Lewis R. Dunn, D.D., Author of "The Mission of the Spirit," "Holiness to the Lord," "The Angels of God," "Sermons on the Higher Life," etc. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. 1889. Price, \$1.00.

This volume consists of Expository Notes. These notes are not of a critical, but of a purely practical character. They are entitled "The Gospel in the Book of Numbers," because their object is to show that in this book the Gospel "undoubtedly is in type and symbol, in rite and ceremony, in prophecy and in illustration." The work is written in a clear and attractive style, and calls attention to many important truths which are strikingly illustrated in that portion of Scripture to which it relates. It is especially suited to the wants of those who read the Bible, mainly for spiritual improvement, and can scarcely fail to be of real benefit to all such persons. Teachers of Bible classes will also find it suggestive and useful.

THE BOOK DIVINE; or, How do I Know the Bible is the Word of God? By Jacob Embury Price. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. 1889. Price, 75 cents.

The question considered in this little volume is one of vast importance. If the Bible is not the word of God then we are without

any special revelation and are left in utter darkness as regards man's final destiny. If we cannot know whether it be the Word of God or not, we are left in a no less deplorable condition. Agnostic doubt as to the character of the Bible, it has well been said, "puts a quicksand under every step; it ungirds the faculties so that they no longer work to any end; it undermines purpose and inspiration, and leaves no path for the feet but aimless desire or native instinct—life a maze, the heavens empty, the solid world the only reality." The author of this work has, therefore, done well in endeavoring to show that such doubt is not warranted by the evidence in the case.

The book itself consists of six lectures, which treat of the history of the Bible, its unity amid variety, its harmony with profane history, its harmony with physical science, its prophetic element, and its central person and life, and points out how these various elements or characteristics imply its divine origin. These lectures are not designed as a new or original contribution to the literature of Christian evidence, but rather as a popular presentation of some of the results of reliable scholarship in this field. They were not prepared for the edification of scholars already proficient in this department of study, but for the instruction of the people generally. In style they are graceful and persuasive, in argument clear and convincing. The book deserves to be widely circulated among those for whom it has been more especially prepared and will amply repay careful reading.

OLD HEROES: The Hittites of the Bible. By Rev. J. K. Fradenburg, Ph. D., D.D., Member of the American Oriental Society, the American Folk-Lore Society, the Society of Biblical Archaeology, of London, etc.; Author of "Witnesses from the Dust; or, The Bible Illustrated from the Monuments," etc. New York: Hunt & Eaton; Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. 1889. Price, in Paper, 50 cents; in Cloth, 75 cents.

The Hittites were the descendants of Heth, the second son of Canaan. Of them Abraham purchased the cave of Machpelah for a sepulchre. Only brief mention is made of this people in the sacred Scriptures, and for a long time very little was known concerning them. Within the last few decades, however, monumental pictures, hieroglyphic texts and cuneiform records have thrown some light on their history. The object of this volume is to point out the different lines of research and to fix the points reached in the investigation. At the same time it answers certain criticisms of the Biblical record and suggests the exercise of a little more scholarly caution in the announcement of Biblical mistakes and inaccuracies. The book is made up of five chapters, or essays, which are respectively entitled: "Old Heroes from Forgotten Graves," "Fighting for Life," "Heroic Dying," "Literature and Art," and "Religion." All these essays are interesting and in-

structive. From the facts presented in them a fair idea may be formed of the character of this ancient people.

THE LESSON COMMENTARY ON THE INTERNATIONAL SUNDAY-SCHOOL LESSONS FOR 1890. By Rev. Jesse L. Hurlbut, D.D. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1889. Price, \$1.25.

This volume has been prepared to meet the wants of Sunday-school teachers in giving instruction on the International Lessons for the ensuing year. It is designed especially to present to them "the results of the widest reading and the latest knowledge; to compare the opinions of many scholars, and to give their conclusions, omitting the long preliminaries and details; to give the best thoughts from many authors on the life of Christ; extracts from authors, monographs and sermons—in short, to supply, as well as one volume can supply, the benefits of a whole library in the department of Christology." A careful examination of its pages shows that all this has been done in a very satisfactory manner. Over two hundred and fifty authors are quoted. In the case of every lesson there is first an introduction, then the lesson itself in the authorized and in the revised version, explanatory notes on the text, helpful references, practical thoughts, and teaching hints. The book also contains several maps and numerous illustrations which add to its value. Of the various Lesson Commentaries that have come under our notice, this is, indeed, in our opinion, the very best.

SUPPLEMENTAL LESSONS FOR THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL. By Rev. Jesse L. Hurlbut, D.D. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1889. Price in Paper, 25 cents.

STUDIES IN THE FOUR GOSPELS. By Rev. Jesse L. Hurlbut, D.D., Author of "A Manual of Bible Geography," "Outlines Normal Lessons," and "Supplemental Lessons for the Sunday-school." New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1889. Price, in Paper, 25 cents.

These two small books are intended as helps to the study of the Bible. The object of the first is more especially to give some instruction in the general facts of Bible knowledge, which every Bible reader requires for the understanding of the book. Among the subjects treated of in this volume are the number and character of the books of the Bible, Old and New Testament history, the life of Abraham, of Moses and of Christ, and the teachings of the Bible. The second volume is designed to guide the young student in his search after knowledge concerning the life, the work, the character, and the person of Christ. It consists of twelve studies which treat, respectively, of the Four Gospels, the Land of Palestine the people of Palestine, the life of Christ, the thirty years of preparation, the year of obscurity, the year of popularity, the year of opposition, the

week of the passion, the day of Crucifixion, the first days of resurrection, and the person of Christ. Both works are admirably suited to the purpose for which they are intended. It would be well if they were used in all Sunday-schools.

BIBLICAL ANTIQUITIES. By Edwin Cone Bissell, D.D. Philadelphia: The American Sunday-school Union, pp. 420.

A knowledge of Biblical Antiquities is indispensable to a right understanding of the Bible. The interpreter must be able to transfer himself in imagination to the times when the inspired writers lived. They make constant allusions to their modes of life—domestic, civil and religious—so different from ours, and without an intimate acquaintance with the circumstances amid which they wrote, we lose much of the meaning they intended to convey. Happily the necessary knowledge is now afforded in clear, compact and accurate form by this admirable manual. It takes the place of Dr. Nevin's work, the excellence of which is attested by the high favor accorded to it for more than half a century. Archæological studies, however, have during this period made rapid advances. Fresh light has been cast upon the Scriptures from almost every spot in the Bible lands. How much has been accomplished by explorations in Palestine and by the decipherment of the inscriptions on the monuments of Egypt, Assyria and Babylonia! The older works, accordingly, are now antiquated. It has become necessary to gather up the results of later research and present them in popular form to students of the Bible. For this task Dr. Bissell is admirably fitted, having the requisite literary and scholarly qualifications, and his work renders excellent service to all who wish intelligently to read the Bible. One has only to compare a chapter of his book with the corresponding chapter in Dr. Nevin's to see how great progress has been made in this department of Biblical science within the last half century. The illustrations alone are a good test. A few decades ago most of them could not have been given. This manual has been adopted as a text-book in many theological seminaries, among the rest in our Seminary at Lancaster, and after a close examination we heartily commend it to all Bible readers as a valuable exegetical aid.

PEOPLE'S BIBLE COMMENTARY ON LUKE. By Edwin W. Rice, D.D. Philadelphia: The American Sunday-school Union, pp. 331.

This volume has many excellent features which make it valuable for popular use. It gives at the foot of the page, in parallel columns, the text of the Common Version of 1611, and the text of the Revised Version of 1881, with the readings of the American Committee incorporated. The Biblical text is divided into topical portions suitable for Sabbath lessons in the family and in the Sabbath-

school, and under these topical divisions, as well as under each verse, the comments are grouped. Each section closes with suggestive applications of a practical character. Throughout are found maps and engravings, from photographs and other original sources, to illustrate the narrative. The author, already favorably known by his "People's Commentary on Matthew," and his "Pictorial Commentary on Mark," as well as by other work, has in this volume rendered much assistance to the Bible student by casting on the sacred page the light to be gathered from a knowledge of the scenery, the people and the habits of life, speech and thought current in Palestine when our Lord lived on the earth. He has gleaned from many fields, from the Jewish Talmud, the early Christian Fathers and the best modern Biblical scholars. His notes are clear, concise and judicious, presenting the results of critical research in a popular style from a conservative point of view. The introduction, though brief, gives all that it is necessary for the general reader to know concerning the authorship, the time and place of composition, the language, style and sources of the Gospel. Plain and practical, the fruit of much study, it is well adapted for use in the family and Sunday-school, and we trust that it may find a wide circulation in the sphere for which it is especially intended.

RAMBLES ROUND THE REFORMED LANDS. By Rev. James I. Good, D. D., Author of "The Origin of the Reformed Church in Germany." Reading, Pa.: Daniel Miller, Publisher. 1889.

It is pleasing for a Reformed to turn from reading a book on the Lutheran Church to this account of foreign lands in which, some sections, at least, of the Reformed Church had their origin. It shows us that even in Germany, as well as in Switzerland, France, Holland and other countries, the Reformed Church grew up in the early days of the Reformation alongside its Lutheran sister. In a former volume the author has given a fuller account of the origin of the Reformed Church in Germany. In this we have, as the title tells us, merely *rambles* in Reformed lands. As we have personally visited many of these places and scenes here described, Zurich, Berne, Geneva, Basle, Heidelberg, Frankfort, the Rhine, Berlin, etc., the report of these rambles serves to render them fresh in our recollection. Dr. Good is an observant traveler. He gives an interesting report of what he has seen. He is also warmly attached to the Reformed Church, and this gives a fascination to him in the places where the Reformed Church in Germany had its origin and early history. Notwithstanding the temptation of the alliteration, we should prefer the title as "Rambles in Reformed Lands," but this is only a matter of taste, and we are met with the old saying, *de gustibus non disputandum est*. So we commend this interesting little volume, title and all.

THE LUTHERANS IN AMERICA. A Story of Struggle, Progress, Influence, and Marvellous Growth. By Edmund Jacob Wolf, D. D. With an Introduction by Henry Eyster Jacobs, D. D. New York: J. A. Hill & Company, 44 East 14th St. 1889.

This is a handsome volume of 540 pages. The author is Professor of Church History in the Lutheran seminary at Gettysburg. He has written valuable articles for the religious press, and in this volume appears as a competent author. The first part gives a brief account of the preparation for the Reformation, and this is followed by a report of Luther's work as the principal leader and hero of the Reformation. This portion of the volume would perhaps be more satisfactory if the author had referred somewhat more definitely to the rise of the Reformed Church, as sharing with the Lutheran, the honors of the Reformation. He refers to the rise of certain subjective sects, but one looks in vain for any reference to the work of Zwingli and Calvin.

Then we think the author makes too much account of the persecutions of a few Lutheran Churches in New York by the Dutch Reformed Church. He says, "The Lutheran Church is no more likely to command favor with the denominations of the Reformed type than with the papal communion." The Dutch Church was, no doubt, exclusive in their New Amsterdam, but they suffered the same persecution afterwards by the Episcopal Church. It was the spirit of the age; but the fact that the Lutherans and German Reformed live together in peace in East Pennsylvania, generally worshipping in the same churches, is a fact sufficient to show that the above remark is too sweeping as applied to all "the denominations of the Reformed type." The exclusive spirit of at least a portion of the Lutheran Church in recent years shows, we think, that this want of amiability is not confined to the Reformed Church.

So, too, the sweeping condemnatory remarks in regard to Calvinism do not well comport with the fact that Luther himself was a predestinarian as well as Calvin.

But in the Lutheran Church this work will certainly meet with favor, as it gives a full account of that Church in this country, as well as in the period of the Reformation, and it deserves to be read by others also outside the Lutheran denomination. The illustrations scattered throughout the volume add much to its interest.

WON BY PRAYER; OR, The Life and Work of Rev. Masayoshi Oshikawa. By Rev. Allen R. Bartholomew, Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Reformed Church in the United States. Philadelphia: Reformed Church Publication Board, 907 Arch Street. 1889.

We have read this little volume of 120 pages with deep interest. This interest has been greatly increased by a personal acquaintance

with the subject of the biography here given. Rev. Bartholomew has done a good work by putting it in print in such good style, and thus making it accessible to the general public, especially to the families and members of the Reformed Church.

Rev. Oshikawa has visited most sections of the Reformed Church in this country, and his history has become so well known that it is unnecessary to refer particularly to the contents of this book. It ought to receive a wide circulation. It cannot fail to stir up a deeper interest in the work of missions in Japan, as carried forward by our Reformed Church. The illustrations add much to its interest.